THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 8. NOVEMBER, 1930. Vol. XX.

IN MEMORIAM

ALFRED FAWKES

ON All Souls' Day, at the age of eighty, Alfred Fawkes passed away, leaving the world the poorer for his passing. Our readers will miss him as a valued contributor to the *Modern Churchman*. His wide learning, mental clarity, brilliant style, fine sense of humour combined with excellent judgment and good taste, gave a rare quality to his articles and reviews. His friends will feel the withdrawal of a rich and pleasant personality, delightful alike in its sanity and courtesy. Modernists are of many kinds, but from the religious standpoint they may be classified as either rationalists or mystics. Alfred Fawkes was a rationalist. His favourite bishop was Thirlwall; his favourite poet Horace; his favourite theologian Whichcote, the Cambridge Platonist, two of whose sayings he delighted in especially:

> Truth lies in a narrow room and in a small compass: vitals in religion are few.'
>
> 'I have always found that such preaching of others hath most commanded my heart which hath most illuminated my head.'

Yet it had not always been so with him. Educated at Eton and Balliol, he became when at Oxford an ardent Tractarian; was ordained Deacon in 1874; served as curate at St. Paul's, Brighton; a year later he entered the Roman Church and was ordained Priest by the Archbishop of Westminster in 1881. In

that Church he remained until 1909. On Easter Day of that year he was received back into the Church of England by John Percival, Bishop of Hereford, for whom he had the sincerest admiration. In 1911 he became Vicar of the little country parish of Ashby St. Ledgers, and so continued until his death. He returned to the English Church a disillusioned but in no sense a disgruntled man. A certain noble reticence and largeness of mind never permitted him to utter personal complaints. The reputations of friends and even of enemies were safe in his hands. Of the Church of Rome he said little, save that it was incredible to him that it should increase in influence among people of intelligence in this country, and that English Churchmen failed to understand the real strength of the Church of Rome, which lay not in her antiquity, dogmatic system, universality, aesthetic charm, but in her superb powers of organization and finance. There was no idealism, sentimentalism, scrupulosity in Roman policy, but a hard realism. Many times has the writer heard him say, 'You do not understand; English clergymen never do; the Church of Rome is an extremely businesslike affair.' It was these practical considerations, not Thomist Theology or Catholic Tradition, which, he believed, always determined Roman policy and practice.

If Alfred Fawkes understood the Church of Rome, he understood the Church of England no less. He understood it as the prophet Jeremiah understood Judah. What grieved him sorely was that so many of the English Church leaders understood the Church of England as little as they understood the Church of Rome. As a consequence, under the plea of Catholicizing the Church of England, they were striving to deprive their Church of its true character, which was both its strength and glory. In his eyes the Church of England was supremely understood by Richard Hooker and Connop Thirlwall. Armed with *The Ecclesiastical Polity* of the one, and the *Charges* of the other, Theophilus Anglicanus could protect it effectively against Papal superstitions and Catholicizing innovations.

He loved the Church of England with a fervent love, and all the deeper and stronger for having been so long separated from her fellowship. By far the best Anglican *apologia* for people of culture is his delightfully-written volume, *The Genius*

of the English Church.[1] In her he beheld the resolve to stand for truth, freedom, pure morality, wise simplicity, and judicious moderation in Christ. Like the great Marquess of Salisbury, he always feared in dealing with human nature 'the swing of the pendulum'—the moral, mental, religious reactions which not a few ecclesiastics zealously create and then afterwards vainly deplore.

> 'Reactions,' he wrote, 'flourish not on their own merits, which are inconsiderable, but on the shortcomings of their opponents, which are often great.'

He was a firm believer in the Establishment of the English Church. He valued it for the practical benefits it conferred on both Church and State. His booklet, '*Shall we Disestablish?*' presents the case for retaining Establishment. He wished that the Free Churchmen could recognize that Disestablishment would lead to the strengthening of the Romanizing tendencies among Anglicans and so, indirectly, to the strengthening of the Roman Catholic Church in England.

His love of the English Church and his recognition of her unique quality he expressed characteristically in the words of another:

> As a great cathedral exhibits examples of many schools and periods of architecture, so the English Church bears on her the mark of these various movements, in particular and in general. She is other than she would have been without them: they have entered into her standards, guided her worship, and formed her distinctive point of view. In a book of exceptional distinction, *John Inglesant,* the writer, himself a Nonconformist, puts into the mouth of his hero an appreciation of the English Church which her detractors—who are often of her own household—would do well to take to heart:
>
> 'I have perhaps occupied a position which enables me to judge somewhat advantageously between the Churches'—the speaker had been a Roman Catholic—'and my earnest advice is this. You will do wrong—mankind will do wrong—if it allows to drop out of existence, merely because the position on which it stands seems to be illogical, an agency by which the devotional instincts of human nature are enabled to exist side by side with the rational. The English Church, as established by the law of England, offers the supernatural to all who care to come. It is like the Divine Being Himself, whose sun shines upon the evil and the good. Upon the altars of the Church the Divine Presence hovers as surely, to those who believe it, as it does upon the splendid altars of Rome. Thanks to circumstances which the founders of our Church did not contemplate, the way is open: it is barred by no

[1] Published by John Murray, price 3/6 (1917).

> confession, no human priest. Shall we throw this aside? It has been won for us by the death and torture of men like ourselves in bodily frame, infinitely superior to some of us in self-denial and endurance. If we cannot endure as they did, at least do not let us needlessly throw away what they have won. It is not even a question of religious freedom only : it is a question of learning and culture in every form. I am not blind to the peculiar dangers that beset the English Church. I fear that its position, standing, as it does, a mean between two extremes, will engender indifference and sloth ; and that its freedom will prevent its preserving a discipline and organizing power without which any community will suffer grievous damage. Nevertheless, as a Church, it is unique : if suffered to drop out of existence, nothing like it can take its place.' (*John Inglesant,* ii, p. 383.)

This is what may be called the Romance of the Church of England : it is a romance which is at once romantic and real. Movements are ephemeral and logic is fallacious : the springs of life lie deeper than they. Such a Church, such a conception of religion, calls for no apology. And, though perhaps it requires the modest grace of a George Herbert to do so without assumption, the English Christian may echo the delicate and characteristic lines in which he recounts the excellencies of that 'British Church' which his verse pictured and his virtues adorned :

> 'But, dearest mother, (what those misse)
> The mean thy praise and glory is,
> And long may be.
> Blessed be God, whose love it was
> To double-moat thee with his grace,
> And none but thee.'

What we have written might suggest that Alfred Fawkes loved the Church of England so well that he wished her to remain unchanged. It is true that he had no love for the Deposited Book and some of the Church Assembly measures. He recognized that changes could be for the worse. Nevertheless he believed intensely in the need for changes provided that they were *changes in harmony with the spirit of the institution and demanded by its changing environment.* He was an unflinching Modernist. His brilliant volume of essays, *Studies in Modernism,* indicates how convinced his Modernism was. The concluding paragraphs of his *Genius of the English Church* indicate it also :

> The reason why institutional religion has lost, and is losing, ground is not because it is institutional, but because the institutions in which it is embodied have to so great an extent ceased to express actual values or to possess actual significance. Institutions, like the Sabbath, were made for man : and the City of Vision has twelve gates. Some will enter in most easily from the silence of the Friends' Meeting ; others from the 'joyful noise' of the Salvationists ; some from the dignified repose of an English Cathedral service ; some from the incense-laden atmosphere of the basilica.

Does it matter, so long as they enter, *how* they enter? For unity may exist without uniformity, as uniformity can and does without unity. The one is a temper, the other a regulation. And the unity for which Christ prayed for His followers is not an artificial identity of formula or usage imposed by terrorism and maintained by fear or custom; it is something on another plane and of a higher order—'the unity of the Spirit, in the bond of peace.'

'They speak perhaps more truly than they know who tell us that for the English Church the time in which we live is critical; that she has come to the parting of the ways. For the larger call is in her ears; she may hear it and follow; or, she may be deaf to it and refrain. In other words, she may resign herself to the distinctive and denominational position of a mere Anglicanism, or she may rise to her high calling and stand for English Christianity as a whole. In the former case, "Abide ye here with the ass" will be her programme. It is a poor one. She will rest on her past; she will appeal to the stationary elements of society—the unthinking, the unintelligent, those who for one reason or another stand outside the main stream of life. She may continue for a time to influence the imagination and sentiment of a section of the nation; she will probably approximate more and more to mediaeval doctrine and ceremonial; by her claim, disputable as it is, to be (in the sectarian sense of the word) Catholic, she may retain a handful of enthusiasts whose natural gravitation is towards Rome. But this road leads nowhere. A Church which takes it may be long in dying, but is on the road to die. In the other case, a great, a very great destiny awaits her—the furtherance of the religious life of the English people at home and beyond the seas. Her characteristic *Via Media* is not, and is not likely to become, a middle term between Rome and Protestantism; the changes that are taking place in Latin Christendom do not look her way. But, "reformed the least" of the Reformed Churches, and inheriting the political genius of the nation to which she owes her distinctive features, she may unite for her own people the best elements both of the old order and of the new. Should it be so, it is not England only that will be the gainer; the *vasti luminis orae* will receive increase.' (*Op. cit.*, p. 199.)

What he wrote of another was true of himself:

He was of the race of Precursors; and it may be said of him, in the words of a great and exceptionally enlightened director of souls, the Abbé Huvelin, '*Vous êtes de l'âme de l'église.*'

> 'Others, I doubt not, if not we,
> The issue of our toils shall see;
> Young children gather as their own
> The harvest that the dead have sown,
> The dead forgotten and unknown.' [2]

[2] *Modern Churchman*, Vol. XIV, p. 20.

H.D.A.M.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Theology of the Lambeth Conference.

Modernist Churchmen who take a pessimistic view of the prospects of Modernism within the Anglican Communion should find a cordial for drooping spirits in the careful perusal of the findings of the recent Lambeth Conference.* Dr. J. M. Wilson, the Nestor of our movement, who was Senior Wrangler some years before the publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, wrote a remarkable letter about the *Lambeth Report* to *The Times* of September 13th, which we are glad to re-publish here.

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD.

A Creative Process.

Lambeth Committee's Report.

Sir,

I think that the Report of the Lambeth Conference has not as yet been received with the deep thankfulness that it deserves from Churchmen. May I be permitted to explain what, in my humble opinion, it has really accomplished for the Church? I shall speak of it in only one respect, but that is perhaps the most important and the most difficult of all to effect.

I shall speak only of the Report on 'The Christian Doctrine of God.' I am aware that reports have only the authority of the committees by which they are prepared. But this Report is unanimously commended to our study in Resolution 2, and therefore comes to us with the authority of the whole Conference.

They have reported on 'The Christian Doctrine of God.' It must have been in the mind of every member of the Conference that we already possess such reports in our Creeds, drawn up in the early centuries of the Church, universally approved and used ever since, and declared by the Lambeth Conference of 1920 to be held by our Church as part of the Catholic Faith, and this declaration is repeated in the 1930 Report on 'The Anglican Communion,' paragraph 6 and elsewhere. What room, it must have been asked, is there for a new Report? Are we, in Conference, to revise and rewrite the Creeds and bring them up to date? Or are we to construct a new Creed? And what is to be done with the old ones? Imagine the difficulty, the impossibility, of any such task. Now observe how they have dealt with this difficulty.

There is in their Report no allusion whatever to the Creeds and no attempt at writing a new one. They begin—shall I say like so many devout and learned, but unpledged, laymen?—to examine, in the light of the knowledge of all kinds that is possessed by our own times, and to state what they hold to be a true, and what they hold to be a mis-

* Published by the S.P.C.K., price 2/6 (1930).

taken, doctrine about God. They give no reason for making no allusion to the Creeds, which might be thought to form the dominating and decisive factor in their opinion. They leave the public whom they address to form their own view of the reason for this calculated abstinence. The Report is not a revision of the Creeds and it is not a Creed itself. It is something wholly apart from the Creeds and independent of them, in origin and in all respects. But it is a very important document, as everyone must feel. What is its relation to the Creeds? is a question which everyone must ask. In what position does it place them? And what is its own position?

The answer is that it silently treats the Creeds, and all the theology of the past, in exactly the same reverent way that men have learned, of late, to treat the Old and New Testaments, and some of the expectations and beliefs of the early Church. It places them quietly in their proper historical setting. And what is this? Nothing in the least revolutionary or sensational or compulsory : it is a process as quiet as the growth of an oak. Not neglecting or treating as of no importance, but rather treating the Creeds as they really are, as educational stages of our Faith, as preparatory, as symbolical, as temporary and approximate; valuable, when rightly used, as historical evidence of the growth, under Divine Providence, of the Kingdom of God. Such and such once were, and such and such still are, only stages in that long history. It recognises that there is no finality yet in sight; but steady progress, slow building, on sure foundations. Everything is more or less immature. We cannot now shirk the responsibility of knowing that we have ages of the future before us as well as ages of the past behind, and that growth is continuous.

But think what such a statesmanlike treatment has quietly effected for us. The document can never be ignored, never forgotten. It marks a gradual emancipation of the religious faculty of man, to be fully realised as men slowly become capable of appreciating it. At one stroke, which has offended no one, it has heralded the liberation of the minds of many Christians from a sense of serious dishonesty, felt in repeating the words of an ancient Creed. The Creeds are historical statements of what our fathers literally believed, and we share the spirit, if not the whole letter, of their belief. We may now repeat them in the sense in which it is plain all our Bishops repeat them.

It is not possible now, it may not be possible for generations to come, to distinguish in every clause of the Creeds between the letter and the spirit. That is inherent in the fact of growth. The Bishops are therefore quite right not to attempt such a task. They know that they are not infallible. Nor are they even pioneers. The pioneers of theology are scholars, professors, historians, saints, students, critics, philosophers, psychologists, mystics, and so on; men who were often regarded at the time as heretics. But when they have accomplished some work to the satisfaction of our growing Church, as they now have done, it is the Bishops' part to consolidate it, and to claim new territory for the Kingdom of God. Such has been the work of pioneers in every branch of study, especially during the last century; and now the Bishops step in, and with an impressive unanimity relieve the Church from a long-felt burden on its conscience.

But the Encyclical does, I think, somewhat more than liberate the consciences of men within the Church. It describes a class of people, now on the fringe of the Church, 'faithful in Jesus Christ,' but not

whole-hearted Anglicans; partly (may we not say mainly?) the class of those who (or whose parents) 'have not revolted against the Gospel, but against a presentation of the Gospel which falls far short of its range and splendour.' It tells them that there is much in the scientific and philosophical thinking of our time which provides a climate more favourable to faith in God than has existed for generations. New interpretations of the cosmic process are now before us which are congruous with Christian theism. It greatly enlarges the limits of the Church. The Report adds that 'The Christian Doctrine of God . . . supplies the guidance which our perplexed generation so supremely needs'; and finally it says that 'we regard this creative process as not only spiritual in its results, but also spiritual in its origin.'

This must be noted. The Report is not only a summary of our intellectual beliefs about God, but it also is spiritual even more than it is intellectual. It supplies a religious motive, and that a surpassingly sublime one, which this generation so sorely needs. It assures us that man is, in a very real sense, an inheritor of the Divine Nature, through and in our Lord Jesus Christ, and that he has a share in Divine gifts and Divine responsibilities. But of this it is impossible to speak now. It will be the text for much teaching.

As it is, the result of the Conference is very great and most encouraging. And in the Report—No. IV—on 'The Anglican Communion' there is nothing to conflict with what we have said. Every Church in our Communion holds the Catholic Faith in freedom. Every Church 'has the right to determine the best method of setting forth to their people the contents of the Christian Faith.'

There is one more notable subject for our thankfulness, in speaking of the Report on the Christian doctrine of God, and indeed of the whole Encyclical and Reports. These documents cannot be criticised as due to the dominating influence of any group or of any one or two personalities. They are essentially the joint work of the whole of our Church, long prepared for and carried through, unanimously in substance, by the whole body of our Bishops, supported and inspired by the prayers of a vast assemblage of the faithful whom no one can number.

It embodies the spirit, and who knows whether it does not add to the joy, of one whom we unite in venerating, Archbishop Davidson.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JAMES M. WILSON.

Steep, Petersfield.
September 12th.

That no one of the Episcopal Committee who drew up the Report has taken public exception to Dr. Wilson's interpretation of it, is an indication that he has stated correctly its profound significance.

The Report, which comprises eighteen pages, will, we hope, be widely read, and prescribed as a Document of the Faith to be studied by ordinands. Among the names of the Committee responsible for the Report are Archbishop D'Arcy, Dr. Barnes, Dr. David and Dr. Strong.

THE BISHOPS AND THE USE OF CONTRACEPTIVES.

The Lambeth Report on Marriage and Sex is not less significant than that on 'The Christian Doctrine of God.' The public attack made on it by Cardinal Bourne and some sections of the ecclesiastical press indicate its departure from the traditional position. It says wise things about the need for sex-education. These are easy to say. The acute situation is reached when dealing with birth-control and the use of contraceptives for that purpose. The Report is extremely cautious, as it has need to be. It denounces uncompromisingly the practice of abortion and the use of contraceptives for purposes of illicit intercourse among the unmarried. It condemns their use by married people who seek to escape those responsibilities of parenthood which they ought to face. Yet it frankly recognizes that there are circumstances in married life which justify, and even demand, the limitation of the family by some means. Cases where a birth would involve grave danger to the health, even to the life, of the mother, or would inflict on the child to be born a life of suffering, or where the mother would be prematurely exhausted and additional children would render her incapable of carrying out her duties to the existing family. The limitation of parenthood in such cases can be achieved by total abstinence from intercourse. This may be the best method in some cases, but it does not seem to be the best method in other cases, and appears to be quite impossible for certain persons living in certain conditions. In such cases the use of contraceptives is permitted by the Report. The conclusions of the Bishops are best given in their own words :

> 'Plainly we cannot provide a complete list of circumstances affording a good moral reason for avoiding conception. But as it seems to us the principle involved is this : Children are the primary end of the intercourse to which marriage leads. Married people do wrong when they refuse to have children whom they could train to serve God and add to the strength of the nation. But intercourse has also a secondary end within the natural sacrament of marriage. Where for any morally sound reason the first end is to be ruled out, it does not necessarily follow that the secondary must be ruled out, provided that self-control is exercised, and husband and wife have truly examined their consciences upon the matter.'

Anyone really acquainted with the condition of poor married people in town or country will be thankful for this decision. It

is a very brave one for the Bishops to have given, and a very honest one, and, what commends it no less, a very humane one. Christ had a withering contempt for those who laid heavy burdens and grievous to be borne upon men's shoulders and refused to touch them with even the tips of their fingers. The Bishops have been willing to face obloquy in giving a decision they might have so easily persuaded themselves there was no need to give.

Lambeth, South India, and Reunion.

If courage, frankness, and humanity were manifest in the Lambeth treatment of the problems of birth-control, diplomatic skill of the highest order was no less manifest in the treatment of the South India reunion proposals. To have accepted the proposals out of hand might have split the Church of England: to have rejected them would have proved the death-blow to all further efforts to secure reunion in the Mission field. The Bishops discovered a *tertium quid*. They postponed the critical decision for thirty years. Many have felt deep disappointment with this decision. It reminds us of 'the Petrine compromise,' when the rival policies of St. James and St. Paul threatened to split the Apostolic Church. We cannot, however, condemn it in view of all the circumstances of the case. *Solvitur ambulando* is a sound method when the progress is forward, not backward, and in this case the movement is forward.

The Bishops have given their blessing, and they ask the Churches of the Anglican Communion 'to stand by our brethren in India, while they make this experiment, with generous goodwill.' The task of working out the experiment in detail they wisely leave to the authorities on the spot in view of the fact that all parties, including the Lambeth Conference, have sanctioned the principles of the Proposed Scheme.

Whilst closer relations are being achieved by the Anglican Communion with the Eastern Orthodox Church, the Old Catholic Church, the separated Eastern Churches, and the Church of Sweden, it is felt by some that the movement for reunion with the Established Kirk of Scotland and the Free Churches has received a check. We do not regard this as being the case, although we do confess that the progress has been less rapid than we had hoped. Nevertheless there has been very real pro-

gress. The Lambeth Conference of 1930 has not gone back on the great declarations of 1920 wherein the 'non-episcopal ministries' are declared to be 'true ministries of the Holy Spirit,' and that not only of the Word, but also of the Sacrament of Holy Communion. This declaration of 1920 has been justified in practical action by the Lambeth Conference of 1930 which sanctions the action of any Bishop who may, on account of the extreme difficulty that Anglican communicants have of receiving the Communion from their own clergy, permit them to receive that sacrament from ministers not episcopally ordained. Also, in this connection, it is permitted to the Bishop to encourage baptized communicant members of Churches not in communion with the Anglican Communion to communicate in Anglican churches, 'when the ministrations of their own Church are not available, or in other special or temporary circumstances.'

Dr. Vernon Bartlet, a stout Free Churchman, a learned student of Church History, and not least a great-hearted and charitable Christian, recognized in a letter to the *Times* of October 23rd,

> 'The epoch-making nature of the advance, in practical application, on the epoch-making enunciation of principle by Lambeth, 1920, marked by Lambeth of 1930.'

We believe his verdict to be as sound as it is generous.

Constructive Birth-Control.

The liberating effect of the Lambeth permission is seen in the following paragraphs from the *North Wingfield Parish Magazine* for November. North Wingfield is a mixed colliery, residential and agricultural parish in the Derby diocese. The Rector is the Rev. F. J. Worsley-Boder. The quotations are from the Rector's letter to his parishioners:

> (1) *Preventive.*
>
> The whole country is worried and perplexed by this blight of unemployment which grows steadily worse. Some parts of the country are in worse plight than our own district. But the conditions here are bad enough. We know that the immediate cure lies in a large recovery in trade, but of this there is little sign as yet. One fact stands out as incontestable, *viz.* that there are many more people ready to be employed than industry can employ. At the best of times there is a surplus population, and in these bad times that surplus has been multiplied about four times. It is plain that, in the past, people have bred too many children, unless there is to be a large policy of Emigration overseas, which does not seem to be probable. If, then, we look to the future, a smaller population will be a safeguard against the worst

effects of such bad times as the present. Many families to-day subsist on half a week's pay, eked out by the 'dole,' and many are worse off than that. It is impossible to keep a family of several children, as well as a working father and a harassed mother, adequately fed in such conditions. If families were smaller, this pressure would be relieved to an extent which present sufferers can now imagine, but cannot enjoy; and the effect would be felt in years to come when consequently fewer people could be thrown out of work at times of industrial depression.

To secure this improvement it is plain that there is need for instruction and help in the theory and practice of birth control among the poorer people. I have been an open and avowed advocate of birth control for some years, and have watched the subject coming more into evidence. To-day the Bishops' resolution at Lambeth, though qualified, recognises that there are cases in which the use of contraceptives is not contrary to good morals. A recent vote of the Medical Profession and a Memorandum of the Ministry of Health show the progress of the movement for more education in the difficult and delicate matter of limiting families. I see no reason why poorer people should be kept at a disadvantage in this important matter. It may be true that some who can afford to have larger families have used the methods of birth control to restrict them too much; but it is also too true that great numbers of the population have been breeding much beyond their competence properly to keep their children; and when they have tried to restrict their families, the methods which they have adopted have been bad. Granted the need of preventive measures, and the use of them, these measures have frequently been found to be both dangerous and ineffective.

(2) *Constructive.*

To meet this need for reduced population, and for relief to married people from the too heavy burden of large families, instruction is necessary to prevent the use of bad methods and to ensure the use of good methods. There are methods in use among the people which are unreliable and dangerous to their health, and there are forms of abortion which cannot too strongly be condemned. But it is not easy for poor people (and many others for that matter) to find out what methods are both sound and harmless.

As Dr. Norman Haire has written, 'To-day the methods of contraception most commonly used are untrustworthy and even harmful. There *are* trustworthy and harmless methods, but the public finds it difficult to learn them' (see *Hymen*, p. 81). In such conditions it may well be asked, Where to go? and What to do?

In the great cities there are clinics to which people who need information and advice can go and get help in their difficulties. These clinics offer the constructive solution of the problem at its present stage. They give much-needed information to mothers who are overtaxed by excessive child-bearing; they correct those using bad methods and show them better ones; they give advice on the better understanding of married life, when husbands and wives have been unfortunate and their sexual life has not been mutual but one-sided; and when married people have failed to produce a family of children whom they desire and can afford to keep, the clinics can sometimes come to the rescue with such advice that fine babies are born in happy homes. This Constructive Birth Control not only discourages the birth of children when the conditions are unfavourable, but encourages it when

the conditions are sound. Could any work be more valuable than this general promotion of well-being, for a population which is overstrained by bad times and depressed wages?

(3) *Practical Policy.*

Now I have to announce that the Travelling Caravan Clinic of the Society for Constructive Birth Control and Racial Progress, which has lately been working in the industrial area of South Wales and has been at Gloucester for the past two months, is coming here for the month of December. The Clinic is staffed by trained nurses who have been engaged at this work for years, and they will be at the service of all the mothers who need advice and help. Meetings will be held and lectures given; and, thanks to the generosity of the Founders of the Society, the services of the Clinic are given free. I am very glad to be able to make this good work known, for I know that there are many who need such instruction as will be given, and many who are anxious to find the way to obtaining it; and there can be few who will not be glad to learn one of the safe sound methods and to be saved from the dangers of prevalent abuse.

The Church has long been engaged in picking up the wreckage of life—a great work indeed; but it is seen to-day to begin at the wrong end, and often takes the form of pouring shillings and half-crowns out of the Sick and Poor Fund into the bottomless pit of indiscriminate charity. But it is a good old maxim that 'Prevention is better than cure.' Sometimes the prevention and the cure are seen to be of one piece and one policy. Nowhere could this principle be better illustrated than in families born of true affection, by deliberate choice and not by chance, their members healthy and their numbers limited, so that the chances of unemployment in years to come are much reduced. Life will then seem to offer new opportunities, new confidence, new courage and a new measure of good will—surely the basis of a true kingdom of heaven, the Christian Commonwealth which we all desire to establish in this world.

We hope many other parochial clergymen will follow this courageous and practical example. The time has come when our district nurses should be trained in birth-control methods and be directed to give instruction about it where such instruction is desired or required. The tragedy of unwanted children is a bitter one, and, as Dean Inge has pointed out, where contraceptives are not used abortion is practised. Birth-control, where contraceptives are used, will not necessarily produce a falling birth-rate, although it will secure a falling death-rate. This has been the case in Holland. What it will also secure is a more eugenic population and more advantageously distributed births among the various classes of the population. According to Dean Inge's latest figures, the birth-rate in this country for Teachers is 95, Doctors 103, Barmen 234, General Labourers 438. Those least able to support and train children in congenial conditions have the most of them.

THE LIBERAL MOVEMENT IN JUDAISM

By C. G. Montefiore, D.D., author of *The Synoptic Gospels*, etc.

THE beginning of 'Liberalism' in Judaism was different from its beginning in Christianity. Its origin in Judaism was apparently due to external things — to forms and ceremonies: I say apparently, for there was really, as soon became manifest, a great deal more involved.

The Jews in Germany—where Reform (as the movement was first called, and is still called in America) began—like the Jews elsewhere, lived, up till the middle of the eighteenth century, a wholly segregated life. They were subjected to many disabilities, though pillage and slaughterings had ceased. A rigid orthodoxy prevailed, both in belief and in practice. Jewish orthodoxy has always had, and still has, more to do with practice than with belief, which makes one difference in the character of the problems which beset Liberalism in Synagogue and Church. The services of the synagogue were lacking, not in fervour, but in beauty and decorum. Then came the desire for emancipation. There was a stirring of the spirit. The French Revolution changed everybody's outlook. One great man had shown how a Jew could be a modern philosopher, a writer of beautiful German, and yet remain ardently attached to the faith of his fathers. That man was Moses Mendelssohn, who was born just two hundred years ago. When the walls, whether the material or the spiritual walls, of the Ghetto began to fall, and Jews began to live wider lives, to associate with their Christian fellows, and to breathe a fuller intellectual and aesthetic atmosphere, diverse religious results ensued. The worship of the synagogue seemed to educated Jews uncouth and tedious, and also inconsistent with the cultivated German environment to which they were now becoming accustomed. The ultra-orthodox Jews scented danger: they looked with hesitation and mistrust upon the results of emancipation: they were determined to make no concessions whatever to any modernization of the ritual or of the ceremonial laws. A good many Jews left the synagogue altogether, and were either baptized themselves, or allowed their children to be

brought up as Christians. Others began the work of outward reform with varying success, some too tentatively and sparingly, some too violently and drastically. In Germany, after some years of activity, there was a considerable period of reaction and stagnation. A certain amount of external reform was accomplished; in many synagogues, organs and a few prayers in the vernacular were introduced; the services were shortened; sermons in German became the regular rule; the general theological outlook and teaching were modified in a Liberal direction; but many causes combined to discourage and damp down all further and more thorough Liberal efforts. The next stage of the movement was in America, but its leaders were young Germans, who found in the great republic of the West a far more congenial soil for Liberalism than in conservative Germany. But I must not further pursue the mere outward history of the movement, or tell of what happened in America, and then in England, and then of the revival in the Germany of to-day. I must rather say something of the inner history of the movement; of what was at the back of the external reforms, of the theoretic and theological problems which soon began to make their appearance.

It was not, as I have said, theological doubts and difficulties which started the Reform movement. It was not troubles about miracles or Biblical criticism. It was, I think, over and above the unsatisfactory and unaesthetic externalities of the synagogue services, something quite different, and not very easy to explain. Jewish orthodoxy has two aspects. There are, doubtless, dogmas, or accepted doctrines, or articles of creed. Maimonides' thirteen Principles of the Faith can be found in all the ordinary orthodox Prayer-books to-day. But more important than these, though logically resting upon them, are the ordinances which control Jewish life, the private life of the individual and the public life (so to speak) of the synagogue. Now these ordinances fitted in with, and gave no trouble to, the segregated Jewish life of the Ghetto: they did not fit in with the life of emancipation: they gave trouble. Moreover, their markedly Oriental character began to obtrude itself upon the awakened western consciousness. Men said: 'We are Germans and Americans: we claim the fullest share in the civic and national life of our adopted fatherland, and we are being given this share. Our religious life must be consistent with our national life. Our reli-

gious outlook must be occidentalized as well as our civic and secular life. Oriental usages are no longer possible for us. More especially we are unable to bear with such classes of laws and usages as (1) have for us no longer any religious or spiritual content or significance, (2) run counter to our modern and western ideas, and (3) too gravely interfere with social intercourse and ordinary vocational or business occupations. In the East Judaism should be oriental; in the West it must be occidental. The fundamental doctrines are everywhere the same. The form, the embodiment, must vary.'

That sounds all very well, but antagonists were not slow to point out a tremendous difficulty. They said: 'How about the divine Law, whether Pentateuchal or Rabbinic? If it is truly the word and the will of God, what right have you to abrogate any part of it? The Law is one. The Pentateuch makes no distinction between the injunction to kindle no fire on the Sabbath and to love your neighbour as yourself. And, *ex hypothesi*, the Law is the gracious gift and the emphatic command of the One God, perfect in wisdom and perfect in goodness. There is not one single word in the Law from beginning to end which declares that any of its injunctions, except those connected with the Temple and the land, are relative to circumstances, or are temporary and permissive, or which distinguishes between moral injunctions that are eternal and ceremonial injunctions that are transitory. The same observation applies to the Rabbinic law likewise. If you tamper with the Law, you do it for the sake of convenience, or you do it because you are already walking down the slippery slope which ends in Christianity. Your children will be baptized, if not yourselves.'

Some theoretic basis had, therefore, to be found for the changes that were demanded or made. It was not the miracles of the Bible which caused the trouble; it was no doctrine about the nature of God or prayer; it was the obligatory and divine character of the Law, either the Pentateuchal Law, or that Rabbinic Law which enlarged, developed, and carried forward the Law of the Bible. An attempt at a theory for Reform was made in one direction which was a complete failure, and was rapidly given up. That attempt was to distinguish drastically and in principle between the Law of the Pentateuch and the Law of the Rabbis. The one was divine; the other human: the one

eternal; the other temporary: the one obligatory; the other permissive. But, apart from all practical difficulties which were many, this separation between Bible and Rabbis was as unfortunate as the famous saying, 'The Bible and the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants.' It could logically only lead to an orthodoxy and to a stagnation far worse than those which it was invoked to remove. It had formed the basis of a Jewish sect in the tenth century known as the Karaites, and this sect, though it still has its sparse representatives even to-day, has never possessed importance, and its orthodoxy has ever been narrower and less progressive than that of the main synagogue, whether in mediaeval or in modern times. Another way out of the difficulty was, therefore, attempted.

It was argued that the Rabbinic Law was by no means always a mere adding on to, a mere drawing out of, the Biblical Law. It did not always make the burden greater; it sometimes made it lighter. The Rabbis occasionally modified the written Law in accordance with the needs, and even with the spirit, of their time. It is true that they had to show that these modifications, somehow or other, really brought out the true meaning of the original injunction; it is true that they sincerely believed in the thorough perfection and thorough divineness of the Pentateuchal code. Nevertheless, they believed that upon them too had descended the spirit of God. They devised a theory whereby they conceived of this spirit, and of the authority which it gave, as continuing from generation to generation. It was a misfortune that the Oral Law was ever written down, and that a time came when the old feeling and assurance of the possession of authority for modifying or moulding or developing the Law, according to the needs of fresh circumstances and fresh enlightenment, passed away. The Reformers argued that this conception of a living and changing Law, of a continuing stream of authority, of a continuous inspiration, must be renewed and revivified. 'Instead of making a violent barrier and separation between Bible and Tradition, the very reverse must be the line of true reform. The verbal inspiration of Scripture must be abandoned, but the inspiration of Tradition must be retained, and we too, in our generation, must humbly claim our place in the living tradition wherein works the spirit of God. We two are links in the chain. God is not far from us, as He was not far from our fathers. All know-

CHURCH DIVINITY SCH
OF THE
PACIFIC

ledge is from Him. We have the duty and the right to continue the work which the Rabbis began. As they developed the Law and the institutions and the ceremonial of Judaism to suit the circumstances and needs of their time, and in accordance with their own highest conceptions of truth, goodness and purity, so let us too humbly and bravely develop them. As in many respects they made Judaism a richer and purer religion than the Judaism of the Bible, so let *us* in our day make Judaism also more rich and more pure. As *they* sought to make every aspect of Judaism consonant with their conceptions of its eternal verities, so also must *we*.'

I have dwelt at a little length upon this argument of the old Reformers, because, in one form or another, the argument has continued to this day. And I conceive that it is, *mutatis mutandis*, an argument which must be common to both Liberal Judaism and Liberal Christianity. If we believe that our own form or conception of our particular religion is, in some important respects, the truest form and conception of it which has thus far appeared, if we believe that there is to be no going back, but, on the contrary, a going forward, then, if we also believe that the hand of God is connected with the future as well as with the past of our religion, we must surely believe too that what *we* are doing with the religion, the changes which *we* are imposing upon it and bringing about, must also be, in some way or other, the will of God. And this belief gives to us our authority.

Now the Reformers were just as ardent and convinced Jews as their orthodox antagonists, and in some ways their claims and anticipations for Judaism were even more exalted and more pretentious. The orthodox Jews, as modern knowledge and modern conceptions of religion began, half consciously and half unconsciously, to influence them, tended to make a distinction between the fundamental *doctrines*, and the institutions and *ceremonials*, of Judaism. The doctrines, they argued, were universal: all men were ultimately to believe in the Unity of God, in His righteousness and loving kindness, in man's service of God through the service of his fellows, in the great moral principles and injunctions taught in the Law and in the Prophets; but only the Jews were to observe the ceremonial Law. That Law was truly a national Law, and its observance concerned only the Jewish people. In one sense, in relation to its

fundamental doctrines, Judaism was a universal religion; in another sense, as regards the Law, it was a national religion.

The Reformers wanted to make the distinction between doctrine and institutions less sharp, and they wanted to do this, not by narrowing the doctrine, but by widening the institutions—by making the ceremonial and the outward a true reflection and expression of the doctrinal and the inward. They did not go so far as to wish actively to diffuse a universalized Judaism among others, or even to offer it for their acceptance, but they did, more or less deliberately, attempt to weaken or abrogate whatever was purely national, and to give to what remained a more purely religious and universalist interpretation. Judaism, they said, according to the Bible story, was once a family religion; it became the religion of a people, of a nation. But the national life was brought to an end, and Judaism then became the religion of a brotherhood, a community—a brotherhood, a community, which possessed, indeed, an historic past, which was linked together by sacred memories, by sorrows and sufferings unspeakable, but yet a community, a brotherhood, the members of which could belong to, and be the loyal and eager citizens of, every civilized nation upon the earth. Judaism was, or, at least, tended more and more to become, a universal religion in its totality, doctrine and ceremonial corresponding with each other, theory and practice forming a harmonious unity. This line of thought is brought out, in rather grandiloquent language, by a passage in the liturgy for the Day of Atonement in the 'Union' Prayer-book drawn up by the Central Conference of American Rabbis (I quote from the edition of 1912). We are there told how in course of time it began to dawn upon the Jews 'like the rising of a new day, that their separation from their ancestral homes, and their dispersion over the earth, far from being a punishment only' (and the word 'only' seems a sort of concession to tradition), 'was in the hand of God a means of blessing to all mankind.' 'Truly,' a little further on we read, 'truly, not backward shall we' (I think 'do we' or 'should we' is really meant) 'turn our eyes, but forward, to the grand and promising future. Though we cherish and revere the spot on which once stood the cradle of our people, the land where Israel grew up like a tender plant, and the knowledge of God rose like the morning dawn, yet our longings and aspirations go forward

toward a higher goal. The morning dawn shall rise into a bright and radiant noon day. The tender sprout shall grow to a heaven-aspiring tree, a refuge to all the families of the earth. This is thy gracious promise proclaimed by thy prophets, and with unshaken faith we wait and hope for its fulfilment.' And at the very close of the service we find these words : 'Enlighten all that call themselves by thy name with the knowledge that the sanctuary of wood and stone which once crowned Zion's hill, was but a gate, through which Israel should step out into the world, to reconcile all mankind unto Thee.'

The changes in the external form, as well as in the outlook and in the doctrine, of Judaism, which were brought about by Liberal or Reform Judaism, provoked intense antagonism from the orthodox groups. Liberal Judaism was, I should imagine, in some respects easier to bring into existence than Liberal Christianity. What I want to emphasize again is that the changes did not touch the doctrine of God. That was, on the surface, at any rate, unaffected. Liberal Christianity has to take up a position as to such important doctrines of the Christian faith as the nature of the Sacrament, the Virgin Birth, the bodily resurrection of Christ, the Incarnation and the Trinity. The very citadel of the faith has, as it were, to be approached and discussed. It is not so with Reform or Liberal Judaism. It is true that the more extreme orthodox Jew sometimes denies the right of the Liberal Jew to call his religion Judaism, but, nevertheless, the more sober among the orthodox realize that, in the fundamental things there is, or there need be, no vast difference between the two branches of the common faith. The single doctrine greatly affected and in question is the full perfection, the full divinity, and the perpetual obligation of the Law—in theory the Rabbinic as well as the Pentateuchal Law, but in modern reality, the Pentateuchal Law first and foremost, and the Rabbinic Law only as its explanation and drawing out. It is true that the Reformers omitted prayers for the rebuilding of the Temple, the restoration of the sacrifices, and the coming of the Messiah, but though such prayers still form a part of the orthodox liturgy, it may very well be doubted how far many orthodox Jews of cultivation and education could honestly, in a palace of truth, declare that they joined with heart and soul in the public recitation of these requests. The hope of a Messianic *age*, of the dif-

fusion of the knowledge of God and of righteousness and peace, is common to orthodox and reformers alike. Again, while the abolition of many a ceremonial has caused much strength of language, it can hardly be said that such abolitions touch the essence of the religion in the same way that changes in the conception of the Divinity of Christ, let us say, may touch the essence of Christianity.

Liberal or Reform Judaism has achieved much. It has kept many within the synagogue who without it would undoubtedly have drifted away. It has had reactions in orthodoxy. Order, propriety, beauty, are found to-day in orthodox as well as in reform synagogues. Moreover, Reform Judaism has helped to make the claims and the position of Judaism as a religion for educated men and women in the western world better known and more widely accepted. There are great numbers of Jews who in belief and observance (the orthodox would say in lack of observance) are really liberal, but who, from sentiment or family ties or lack of energy or dislike of divisions, still belong to orthodox synagogues, and so nominally to Orthodox Judaism.

But I would pass now to the special difficulties which confront Liberal or Reform Judaism. For if, as compared with Liberal Christianity, it has had certain advantages, it has, on the other hand, special difficulties with which it has to contend, which are impeding its progress, and which may possibly, to some extent, alter its character.

To begin with, it is now felt that the great American reformers were inclined to reform too much. They rationalized too much. They did not leave enough room for emotion, for poetry, for a higher and purer mysticism. Again, attention was called to the small extent of dogma in Judaism. If you attack the Law, but leave the Unity, the Righteousness, of God, if giving up the ceremonials, or denying their obligatory character, you emphasize what you call the prophetic elements of Judaism, and the laws and ideals about righteousness, pity, justice and peace, how far does the religion which remains or ensues bear a specifically Jewish character? Is it not very near Unitarianism? And will not, sooner or later, your Reform Jews become Unitarians, and in the next generation pass on, by easy stages, from Unitarianism to the dominant creed? Is not Liberal Judaism a mere stepping-stone or halfway-house to Christianity?

Now, as a matter of fact, this particular criticism has not been justified by the event. Liberal Judaism has kept many more Jews within, than it has driven others beyond, the pale. But it may be true that it has not been sufficiently attractive to hold all those fast to its banner, or to allure all those within its boundary, who have been, or who are, infected with indifference, with dislike towards all institutional religion, or with scepticism. What are the causes for such want of attractiveness? The lack of the emotional or mystic element, the excess or predominance of the rational element, may be one of these causes. But I will not dwell upon it, because it is, I think, only an accidental cause. In the nature of Liberal Judaism itself there is no reason why it should not produce its mystics as well as orthodox Judaism. If you have God and man, why should you not also have mysticism? But another cause may be more genuinely due to a defect or a difficulty which is really inherent in the Liberal Jewish position. I have pointed out how the tendency of Jewish Liberalism has been to occidentalize and universalize the religion: to remove from it all national elements which were not capable of receiving a purely religious and, indeed, a non-national religious interpretation. 'My house shall be called,' said the Prophet, 'a house of prayer for all peoples.' And Reform or Liberal Judaism has had the tendency, not always consciously expressed, to work towards this universalistic end by making of Judaism and of Jewish worship a religion and a cult in which men and women of all races and peoples might feel at home, by making it in *all* its parts, in doctrine and in outward manifestation, a truly universal religion. Liberal Judaism has not, indeed, sought to proselytize: it has not sent out its missionaries to the adherents of other creeds, but it has laid great stress upon the religious and universal, and it has consistently depreciated the racial and particularist elements of the faith. But the process of universalization cannot be hurried. The results of history cannot be too rashly ignored. After all, the adherents of Judaism are not, like the adherents of Christianity or of Mohammedanism, obviously recruited from many races, and do not obviously consist of men of the most diverse blood. After all, there is much in historic Judaism, whether we like it or not, which is closely mixed up with the history of one particular race or one particular people. It is the particularist element which, perhaps, has always supplied,

and must still for long supply (so it may be argued), those emotional supports and attractions, those tender and alluring associations, those romantic and passionate attachments, of which there is need, and for the lack of which Reform or Liberal Judaism has failed to achieve all that it might otherwise have accomplished. Religion, so many Liberals feel, must be supernational: the days of national religions are over and gone. But the passage from particularism to universalism may have to be circumspect and slow: there is a poetry, a bond, a stimulus, an excitation, in blood, in history, in memories, and history and memories in Judaism are the history and memories of a race or of a people.

Here, then, we have a difficulty totally different from the difficulties of Liberal Christianity. And this difficulty has become increased a hundredfold by the appearance of Zionism, and by the revival of Jewish nationalism.

To speak fully about Zionism and Jewish nationalism even only as regards their effects upon, and their relations with, Liberal Judaism, would need a long paper entirely devoted to that one subject. I mention *both* Zionism *and* Jewish nationalism: the two are very closely connected with one another, but they are not wholly identical. There are many Zionists who cannot be regarded as strong nationalists: there are even, I believe, some nationalists who are not Zionists. The continuance and heavy pressure of anti-Semitism in eastern Europe, in Austria and in Germany, together with the revival and increase of nationalistic sentiment all over the world, have been the fostering hot-beds of Zionism and Jewish nationalism. Thousands of Jews lost heart: 'If the nations will not let us become one with them in all things except religion, let us have a nationality, a national existence, and even a national land, of our own.' Some Jews there undoubtedly are who feel themselves as much nationally Jews, as Danes feel themselves Danes. Of these a large proportion are alienated from religion. But, with some, this national feeling goes with a religious belief, coalesces with it, and forms a unity. We have to remember, first, that in eastern Europe, religion and nationality do commonly go together; secondly, that many eastern European states are made up of many divergent and often discordant nationalities. The recovery of Palestine, the rebirth of the 'national home,' have given a fresh idealism

to thousands, and perhaps even to millions, of Jews who could not possess the idealism of patriotism in their own anti-Semitic lands. But a large number of Zionists do not look upon the Jews as constituting a people of the same kind as the Danes or the Swedes. They are anxious for a national life in Palestine in order that there may be a new outcropping or efflorescence of a specific Jewish culture, Jewish ethics, Jewish civilization, or even (with some) Jewish religion. The romance of all this has taken possession of a certain proportion of Jewish youth even in a country like England where there is virtually no anti-Semitism, or in America where it exists only in a peculiar, social form.

To Liberal or Reform Judaism, however, when added on to the troubles I have already alluded to, Zionism presents a most serious problem, and does undoubtedly interfere with its prospects and its progress.

For, on the one hand, most Liberal Jews are opposed to Zionism, and most Zionists are either opposed to Liberal Judaism or, at any rate, are far more interested in Zionism than in Liberal Judaism. I am trying to give as objective a picture as I can, but it is only fair to add that I am a strong anti-Zionist, and that, to my mind, the fact that most Liberal Jews are opposed to Zionism is justified. For to such Liberal Jews, Zionism and Jewish nationalism seem religious retrogressions. The forward movement of Judaism has been a decentralizing and universalizing movement. Zionism and nationalism seem a return to an outworn particularism; Judaism would once more tend to become a purely national religion, and as such would have little value and little power. The ideal of the synagogue as a house of prayer for the men of any people upon earth would be definitely abandoned. To such Liberal Jews a religious antagonism to Zionism and nationalism seem logical and inevitable; and the antagonism of most Zionists and nationalists to Liberal Judaism seems no less so.

But it has to be emphatically stated that this brief analysis by no means exhausts the facts. There are those who hold that Liberal Judaism is thoroughly compatible with Zionism and Zionism with Liberal Judaism, and among those who thus believe are men who are by no means among the most lukewarm Zionists. Some say: 'Just because I am a Liberal Jew, therefore I am a Zionist, and just because I am a Zionist, therefore I am

a Liberal Jew.' What is the exact texture and nature of this Zionistic Liberal Judaism, and how it is related to the universalism which I should have thought must be so dear to the heart of every Liberal Jew, I do not profess to know. Has the ideal of the prophet been abandoned, or is it retained? 'Also the foreigners that join themselves to the Lord, even *them* will I make joyful in my house of prayer.' What is the modern interpretation of these words, and how are they to be translated into reality? The synagogues in Berlin, London, and New York are to me of far deeper religious importance than any synagogue in Jerusalem.

But with these very inadequate remarks I must pass away from the grave problem of Zionism and say a few words about Biblical criticism and miracles. Here, as I fancy, Reform or Liberal Judaism occupies a strong position. Here, to my thinking, the Jewish Liberal is perhaps on firmer and more comfortable ground than his Christian brother. Upon miracles Orthodox Judaism is not, I believe, now very insistent. Its specific doctrines are not very closely concerned with them, though I never can quite make out what becomes of the Ten Commandments, or the orthodox view of them as a direct divine utterance, if the story of their miraculous promulgation upon Mount Sinai is to be treated as legendary. But about Biblical criticism Jewish orthodoxy is naturally very sensitive, for if the Pentateuchal Law be neither Mosaic nor homogeneous, and if it be neither religiously nor morally perfect nor verbally inspired, the whole theory of orthodoxy, which depends upon the inviolable authority of this perfect, homogeneous, Mosaic and divine code, falls (as it seems to me) inevitably to the ground. Liberal Christianity, as regards the *Old* Testament, is in a much stronger position. It has a second line of defence, and it can be, and indeed often is, content to throw the Old Testament in all respects to be as fully devoured by the wolves of criticism as their appetites may desire. But Liberal Judaism, though it has no second line of defence, is nevertheless freer than Liberal Christianity. For while the wolves may gorge themselves upon the Old Testament, they may have only a limited repast upon the New. I remember once, very impertinently and flippantly, asking a distinguished Christian theologian how much New Testament criticism Christianity could stand. I said to him, 'Supposing

the hypothesis of Drews turned out, *per impossible*, to be well founded, and it were clearly established that no such personage as Jesus of Nazareth ever existed, could Christianity continue?' He said, 'No, it would collapse like a pack of cards.' I replied, 'Well, up to what *degree* of criticism does the edifice remain safe and sound, and at what *point* would it begin to crumble?' He laughed, and said, 'That is a very difficult question, and I am not prepared to reply.' It is obvious that if certain incidents in the Synoptic Gospels are not historic, and certain sayings are not authentic, the situation might become decidedly awkward and uncomfortable. And Liddon long ago realised that critical hunger would probably not be satisfied by Old Testament morsels. But Liberal Judaism feels very secure. To it whether Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were real men or no matters little or nothing. If you could show that even Moses never existed, Liberal Judaism need hardly turn a hair. The Ten Commandments may belong to the seventh century, and it can afford to smile. That the Pentateuchal Law is neither homogeneous nor perfect does not upset its equanimity. In fact, the imperfection of every human work, and of all human utterances, is a part of its creed. The words of a law-giver or a prophet may be what we call inspired, but they are not perfect. Standing upon the shoulders of giants, we can see further than they. That is a principle of reform and of progress.

Sometimes I have been told that, as compared not only with Orthodox, but also with Liberal Christianity, Liberal Judaism, while wonderfully *free*, is yet a *thin* religion. Christian friends have said to me, 'We prefer less freedom and greater richness.' It is not for me to make any rejoinder to this sally. I will only make two final observations. The first is that while Liberal Judaism is very free about the Bible, it has its own peculiar *noli me tangere*, its own Achilles' heel if you will, about which it is *not* free. For it is rooted, no less than orthodox Judaism, in the dangerous and very questionable dogma of the continuing religious mission of Israel, not concluded just nineteen hundred years ago. The second is that it is the urgent business and duty of Liberal Judaism to show and to prove that a religion in which the conception of God is so rich and prominent need not become, or be justly stigmatized as, thin.

THE KUOMINGTANG AND RELIGION

The Place of Religion in the Programme of National Reconstruction in China.

By the Rev. A. R. Kepler, D.D., General Secretary of the Church of Christ in China.

ONE of the most critical questions confronting the missionary enterprise in the world to-day, if not the most critical, is the future of Christian education in China. The crisis is unique in that it has arisen not out of the failures of Christian education, but in a large measure out of its successes.

When the missionary arrived in China a century and a quarter ago, he found a system of education, national in its scope, centuries old, and classical in its content, but entirely unacquainted with modern scientific thought and educational methods. With the assured conviction that an educated and enlightened Christian is potentially the most fruitful Christian, and in order to train the future leadership of the Christian movement, the missionary opened and multiplied schools and became the father of modern education in China.

In spite of their financial and other limitations, the mission schools made good. As a general rule, strict discipline was enforced, thorough scholarly work was demanded of the students, and the graduates were occupying increasingly numerous places of influence. Missionary colleges and universities were occupying strategic centres throughout the country. Christian middle schools for boys and girls were found in most of the large cities, while more than five thousand primary schools could be found in the 'hsien' city and market town throughout the whole country, until the numbers of students attending Protestant mission schools were 200,000, five per cent. of all the students receiving a modern education in China.

An Educational Commission composed of several of the outstanding educators in the West came to China to make a careful survey of our Christian educational activities in order to plan for a still more effective employment of education as a Christianizing agency. This was a worthy motive born from the realization

of the great need of modern education by the youth of China, a need far too great for the Government alone to meet, and also born from the deep conviction that the most worth-while type of modern education was an education founded on Christian principles and taught in a Christian spirit.

Such was the situation of Christian education in China a decade ago. It formed so large a proportion of our Christian enterprise in China that there was danger that the Church might be looked upon as an appendage of the Christian educational enterprise rather than Christian education as an agency of the Church.

Young China became alarmed when she awoke to the place which Christian education occupied in the nation. The survey by the Educational Commission helped to increase this fear. They envisaged, not without cause, a cultural invasion by the West, by which their old culture and traditions would be endangered. One need not unduly exercise his imagination to appreciate this fear. It was not wholly unfounded. Undoubtedly nationals of the West would have reacted in a like manner under similar circumstances.

Out of this situation and under these circumstances emerged the policy of the Government's Ministry of Education to control all the educational activities within the nation and to insist upon the registration of all schools, whether established by the Government or conducted by missionary and other private agencies. It should be added, however, that as far back as 1915 the Government was planning for the registration of all schools, both Government and private. We are sure that no one can quarrel with the Government over the wisdom of this policy.

The missionary societies have been making every effort to remove the causes of the criticism that the Christian schools in China are foreign institutions, foreign financed and foreign controlled and with foreign cultural invasion as their objective, by transferring the control of these schools just as rapidly and as completely as possible to Chinese agencies. And if the question of registration and government control were merely a question of conforming to minimum equipment and curriculum and efficiency requirements, there would be very little objection on the part of the Christian educational agencies to register our church schools.

Another element, however, entered into the situation : at the time when this fear of cultural invasion began to manifest itself, and mission-conducted schools began to be regarded with disfavour and even opposition, China was honoured by prolonged visits from two of our foremost Western educationalists and philosophers. We refer to Dr. John Dewey and Dr. Bertrand Russell. The convictions these two men hold with regard to the place of religion in the education of the child and the adolescent are too well known to require statement here. Suffice it to say that, synchronous with their visit, emerged the opposition to the Christian elements in our mission and church conducted schools and the movement to eliminate religion altogether from education.

The first indication that the Government was influenced by this propaganda was the inclusion, among the regulations for schools that sought registration, of a provision forbidding such schools to have either required Bible instruction or compulsory attendance upon worship. While these regulations were acceptable to a large element within the Christian Movement, there was undoubtedly still a large majority who did not see the way clear to put religious instruction and worship upon a wholly voluntary basis in mission schools. They took the position that when the student, of his own volition, made application for enrolment in the Christian school, he by that act elected to receive Christian instruction and to participate in Christian worship.

Many of those who had taken the latter position, after further reflection, believing that they could still maintain Christian schools even though all religious exercises were put on a voluntary basis, were ready to accommodate themselves to Government requirements. Then unexpectedly new and more restrictive regulations were issued by the Government on August 29, 1929. Article 5 of Chapter I of the new regulations is as follows :

> 'A private school founded by a religious body is not permitted to give religion as a required subject, nor is religious propaganda permitted in the class instruction. If there are any religious exercises, students shall not be compelled or *enticed* to participate. *No religious exercises shall be allowed in primary schools.*' [1]

This article is interpreted by the Ministry of Education as prohibiting voluntary religious instruction in both primary and junior middle schools, and voluntary worship as well in primary

[1] Italics are the writer's.

schools. Moreover, we have been informed by the Vice-Minister of Education that voluntary religious instruction or worship will not be permitted within the primary school building, even outside regular school hours.

Since these new regulations were issued a year ago, additional regulations have been issued from time to time, still further restricting the Christian influences in Church conducted schools, until it has become quite evident that the major objective of those who are insisting upon excluding religion from education in our schools is not merely the control by the Government of Church conducted schools and the divorcement of religion from education. The major objective of this aggressive group is to eliminate religion, not merely Christianity, but all religion, from the life of the nation and the individual. If this group were asked to formulate their conviction upon this matter, they would doubtless phrase it in some such way as this :

Religion is an outgrown superstition and should have no place in a civilized modern state.

We do not believe that the majority of the leadership in the Kuomingtang would subscribe to this principle. But the vocal and the potent element within the Party is passionately pressing it upon the Government with no small degree of success.

The conviction that religion is an outgrown superstition and should have no place in a civilized modern state can readily be traced to its source : it is the result of current popular philosophies and tendencies in the West, such as humanism and secularism and the mechanistic view of the universe. The same impacts upon religion are being experienced in the West. But the Christian religion has been too deeply rooted in the West and still forms too fundamental a part of our Nordic culture for such isms and philosophies to have so serious an effect.

To a certain degree this attitude toward religion is undeniably due to Bolshevik influences. Furthermore, the leadership in this movement to eliminate religion from the emerging Chinese state, secured their education in Continental Europe, where they became acquainted with the repressive influence of the Russian Church upon Russia's masses. They likewise have first-hand knowledge of the insistent efforts of the Roman Church in European countries to control the education of the

youth, and of the reactionary influence of the Church in these countries toward all scientific progress.

A second principle, supplementary to the one already stated and ardently advocated by the anti-religion propagandist and by the overwhelming majority of Chinese educationalists, might be formulated as follows:

> *Each individual should be enabled to make choice for himself what religion, if any, he wishes to embrace, which makes it necessary to safeguard the child's mind against religious teaching until maturity is reached.*

This second principle implies that religion has no place in education and that there must be complete divorcement of education from religion, an implication diametrically counter to the convictions and experiences of Christian educationalists and which we find so clearly and forcibly expressed in the Jerusalem Meeting Statement on Religious Education.

The prevailing attitude of the Chinese Church regarding religious education and the worth of religion in education may be briefly expressed in the following two statements from the Report of the Board of Education of the Church of Christ in China and approved by the General Council of the Church of Christ:

> 'We strongly affirm our conviction that religion has an essential place in education, and that education will not be complete if it affords no place or opportunity for the moral and spiritual values of religious education. . . .'
>
> 'Religious education, the end of which is the nurture of an informed faith in Jesus Christ and the dedication of a trained and obedient life to His service, should be permitted as voluntary courses in all grades of Christian schools.'

Furthermore, it is encouraging to know that there are some, though all too few, non-Christian educators among the Chinese who recognize the essential value of religion in the education of youth. In the September 3rd, 1930, issue of *The Chinese Nation* appeared an article by Dr. Lim Boon-Keng on 'The Need of Educational Reform.' Dr. Lim is one of the outstanding non-Christian educationalists of experience in China, the organizer and President of Amoy University. In this article referred to, Dr. Lim points out that mere knowledge without the necessary moral and spiritual development is inadequate:

> '. . . The object of education is to produce the man or woman of culture who is to introduce religion, law, knowledge, art, and wisdom into the world, and who can only succeed if he or she has imbibed the

divine *Love* which alone can invest our humanity with power and glory! It may be safely stated that unless our educational leaders have faith in some sort of religion or cult, they will fail to accomplish much for the rising generation. . . .

'But the root of the evil (in our present educational system) is that there is no religion to show or to teach. No doubt, in many cases, there exists the idea that science or ethics or philosophy may take the place of religion. Any of these subjects, if properly taught, will naturally lead near to religion, which, however, is concerned much more with the personality of the student than with his knowledge. *To teach religion means that the teachers and directors must live it in such a way that their religion requires no witnesses.* The old stoical Confucianists are agnostics with reference to the attributes of the infinite, but, nevertheless, they are firm believers in religion.'

'The government must uphold the principle of 'religious toleration,' which, however, does not mean either religious negation or religious restriction. So it is really up to the parents and guardians to have religion provided and taught at home. The domestic life must illustrate the art of living, if religion is to have any value. *But the pupils attending schools should have the doctrines and principles of their religion taught or practically illustrated by living examples in their own little world.'*

'The ideal scholar cannot act quite satisfactorily without a background of religion. *Therefore, it is indispensable for the schools to provide the basis upon which alone true culture may exist.'* [2]

But apart from the pedagogical implications of the principle that the non-adult should be safeguarded against religious bias until maturity is reached, the enforcement of this principle will be a powerful aid in achieving the previously stated major objective, namely, the elimination of religion from the modern state.

The leaders in this movement are skilled psychologists and realize that the early adolescent period is the time when a person is most responsive to religious influences. If, therefore, religious influences can be kept out of the lives of children and of adolescents, the chances are greatly multiplied that religion can be eliminated from the life of the nation.

That the agencies which are actuating the Government's policies with regard to religion in education have a much more comprehensive objective than the elimination of religion from our schools is indicated by the 'fixed policy' stated by the Ministry of Education within the last few months. We refer to the 'fixed policy' denying passports to any Chinese students who wish to study abroad unless they first give assurance that they will not include any religious subjects among their post-graduate studies abroad.

[2] In the last three paragraphs the italics are the writer's.

In seeking to safeguard Chinese children and adolescents against religious influences and bias, the following measures either have already been made operative or are looming upon the near horizon :

(1) Prohibit religious teaching and worship in all primary and junior middle schools, closing such schools as refuse to accept this regulation. As previously stated, this regulation has already been promulgated by the Ministry of Education. But since the petition by the Christian churches asking for the repeal of the restrictions against religious instruction in church conducted schools was presented to the Ministry, the Ministry has announced that the enforcement of the said regulation would be postponed for another year.

(2) Prohibit the display of religious pictures, books and periodicals in school libraries and eliminate other Christian influences and agencies from schools. The Ministry of Education in July, upon instructions from the Central Party Committee, issued an order to the Educational Commissioners in all the provinces, which read in part as follows :

> 'The Central Party Committee has found that Christian schools in various places exhibit in their libraries Christian literature for students to read and it is unavoidable not to affect the minds of students in school. . . . The Ministry of Education considers that religious books, papers, magazines and pictures in the Christian school libraries calculated to stupefy the minds of the youth, should be strictly forbidden, excepting those which have to do with selected courses related to the study of philosophy in senior middle schools and universities; all others have to be forbidden.'

Pressure is being brought to bear upon the Ministry of Education to issue regulations whereby it will be possible for the Ministry to remove principals from schools and appoint principals satisfactory to the Ministry in their stead. If such a regulation should be put into force, it would be practically impossible for our schools to maintain a Christian atmosphere and influence.

At the recent meeting of the National Educational Association, a resolution was passed to the effect that :

> 'No person who is not Chinese and no group which is not entirely Chinese in organization, can be allowed to establish primary schools and kindergartens. Teachers and administrative staffs of such schools must be limited to Chinese.'

It has been the policy of the Ministry of Education hitherto to

consider recommendations from the National Educational Association as mandatory. At the time of writing we have not yet seen an order promulgated by the Ministry conforming to this resolution.

(3) Close churches which attempt to teach religion to non-adults. This measure has up to the present advanced no farther than to take the form of a recommendation to the Government. The recommendation does, however, have behind it such influential Tangpu (Party Organizations) as the Tangpu of Greater Shanghai and the Provincial Party Committee of Shantung, who have proposed the following restriction :

> 'Religious organizations are not permitted, under the name of "Pu Tao Tang" (preaching halls), "Hsueh Tao Yuan" (theological institutes), etc., to gather Chinese youth and give them religious instructions. *Organizations founded for the purpose of studying religions shall not permit non-adults of Chinese nationality to become members.*[3] Those disobeying this order shall be closed immediately.'

The Chekiang Provincial Department of Education presented a communication to the Ministry of Education on the desirability of taking some such steps as are contained in the above proposal. This communication was submitted to the Ministry shortly after the petition for the repeal of the restrictions against religious education in Christian schools had been received from the Christian churches. It is quite possible that this petition from the Christian element within the nation influenced the Ministry in their reply to the proposal of the Chekiang Provincial Department of Education. The Ministry, rejecting it, replied that the proposal :

> 'That all children under the age of 13 should be expressly prohibited from attending any religious service is a measure contrary to the principle of religious toleration as well as to China's commitments to foreign states. Parents should however be urged to send their children below the age of 13 to registered or Government schools to receive an education free from religious bias.'

The Christian movement in China can be very thankful for this recognition by the Government of the rights of Christians to give religious instruction to their children. But it is not at all inconceivable that at any time in the future, upon repeated pressure by some of the influential Tangpu (Party organizations), provincial or local, the Ministry may set aside this ruling and prohibit churches from conducting week-day schools of

[3] The italics are the writer's.

religion in the church or having classes for religious instruction of the children in the church on the Sabbath.

Should the group, which is attempting to eliminate religion from the new emerging Chinese State, succeed in enforcing regulations as outlined in (1), (2) and (3), undoubtedly the next trench they would attack would be the Christian home. They would seek to prevent parents from giving religious nurture in the home. That such a measure is not wholly imaginary is indicated by a statement made by the Vice-Minister of Education to a group of Christian educators when he remarked that just as the parents in the new State no longer have the right to choose their child's marital mate, so neither have they the right to determine their child's religious relationships. The implication in this statement is that if parents give religious instruction to their children in their childhood years, the children will be so biassed as to be robbed of the freedom to make their own religious choice upon reaching maturity. That the Government will ultimately attempt to employ such an extreme measure as to invade the rights of the home and the parents is not wholly improbable. We do not believe that the issue will reach this stage if the Chinese Christian forces, particularly the Chinese churches, adopt a winsomely aggressive policy and courageously contend for the right of religious liberty for the individual and the family.

In view of the fact that a determined, potent element in the Kuomingtang considers as fundamental the principle that religion is an outgrown superstition and should have no place in a civilized modern state, and a still larger group are united with them in the conviction that each individual should be enabled to make choice for himself what religion, if any, he wishes to embrace — which makes it necessary to safeguard the child's mind against religious teaching until maturity is reached — it will be recognized that the problem confronting the Christian movement in China is one vitally affecting and challenging the very existence of religion in the life of the individual and of the nation. Instead, therefore, of being an educational question merely, whose solution rests with the Christian educators, it is a problem which demands the most careful and prayerful consideration of the whole Church, a crisis which can be successfully faced only by united co-operation on the part of all the Christian forces in China.

By making concessions here and concessions there, without protesting against the ever tightening restrictions which the Ministry of Education has been imposing upon our Christian institutions and upon the exercise of religious liberty, the rank and file of the Chinese Church were becoming bewildered, and they began to wonder if there are any among our Christian values which are worth contending for and preserving at all costs. We are so free to surrender; and as a result, the individual and group morale of the Christians began to register very low. One of the chief reasons for submitting the petition for the repeal of the restrictions against religious education and worship in church schools was to revitalize the morale of the Christian communicants.

If the Church does not offer active resistance to the movement to eliminate religion from the new Chinese State until the third line of trenches — Christian nurture in the home — is attacked, the morale within the Church will be at such a low ebb that there will not be enough vitality and conviction left to offer any resistance. Such a policy is a defeatist policy, and it has not been upon such a policy that Christ founded His Kingdom, nor have the achievements of the Church in the past been the product of any such policy.

If religion has an essential place in the life of the individual, if religion is indispensable in the training and education of youth and in the production of the highest type of personality, then the believers in religion in general and Christians in China in particular have it as their patriotic duty to see that these indispensable rights are recognized and given opportunity to function in the new Chinese State. Christians cannot expect the opponents of religion—men who are sincere in their convictions, though we believe them to be sadly mistaken convictions —to make the necessary provision.

The question here naturally arises, How is the Church in China to respond to the situation which has been thrust upon her? Kuomingtang educationalists favourable to religion as such but simply seeking to keep religion out of secular education, present entirely a different situation from the Kuomingtang educationalists avowedly disbelieving in religion, labelling it a soporific and avowedly preferring to see it eliminated from

the State altogether. Therefore, as we seek a solution to our educational problem, we must be continually mindful of the major objective of the opponents of Christian education: the elimination of religion from the reconstructed State.

In the first place, we should recognize the necessity of applying a vertically uniform policy to all our schools. It seems to be the prevailing trend to register schools of senior middle school grade and our colleges and universities, but to refrain from registering the schools of primary and junior middle grades. *Such a policy by the very force of circumstances will compel us also to register all the primary schools and junior middle schools or close them.* For registered schools will not be permitted to receive students from unregistered schools, even though the applicants are ready to submit themselves to a grading test. Already situations have arisen where applications by Christians for admission to registered Christian high schools and colleges have been refused because Government regulations prohibit those registered Mission schools from receiving Christian students who apply from unregistered schools.

We might therefore just as well recognize the fact that we must have a complete system of education of unregistered schools, from the kindergarten to the college, if we wish to carry on with any unregistered schools at all. Such a course is based upon the assumption that the Government will permit such a system of unregistered schools, an assumption for which there exists no valid ground whatsoever. For unless the Government has a change of heart and a change of mind, both of which are within the realm of possibility, they will assuredly close all schools which do not submit to registration, beginning with the schools of the Capital and the contiguous provinces, and extending the enforcement in an ever-widening radius until all the schools within the country have either registered or closed.

There are three possible courses which the Chinese Church at present can pursue:

The *first and simplest course would be to register, forthwith, all our schools and make them conform to Government regulations.* For obvious reasons we will not dwell on the advantages of this course; the objections against it are sufficiently patent and potent.

The *second course* possible to the Chinese Church to pursue *is to close at once all our existing educational institutions.* This is the course which has been adopted by the Honan Diocese of the Anglican Church. The Rt. Rev. William C. White, Anglican Bishop of Honan, has very forcefully and concretely summarized their policy as follows:

> 'I cannot speak for the Treaty Ports, but I am strongly of the opinion that for the interior of China the Church will not lose by relinquishing mission schools, but will stand to gain. In the past, missionary educational work has played an important and useful part in building up the Christian Church of China, but present conditions demand a radical change. Apart from the main work of the Church, our chief concern in an educational line must now be: (1) the education of the children of Christians in a Christian environment, which can be provided for them in great measure even when attending Government schools; (2) the special training of Church leaders; and (3) the more systematic development of religious education throughout the Christian constituency in general.'

It may be pointed out that such a procedure as outlined above will not preclude a group of individual Christians, in their personal capacity, from organizing themselves into a body to establish and conduct a private school in conformity to Government regulations. There are distinct assets in having the children of Christians attend a school free from the anti-Christian and irreligious influences that are resident in non-Christian schools; though even such schools might be of questionable value in the event that the Government should adopt regulations empowering the educational authorities to dismiss and appoint the headmaster of private schools.

Nor need this second course outlined above materially affect our larger Christian universities. The large investment of capital and missionary personnel in our higher educational institutions has long since led some to question whether the Christian movement in China would not be better served if the maintenance of our Christian colleges and universities were transferred to specially formed foundations in the West. Instead of being then an integral part of the missionary enterprise, occasioning many misconceptions as to what constitute the primary and what the secondary elements in the Chinese religion, these institutions would be the expression of friendship, good-will and Christian helpfulness on the part of philanthropic Christians of the West to China, to assist her in her task of national re-

construction. The Chinese Church could co-operate with the universities and colleges so maintained, by means of hostels, student pastors and the organization of Christian fellowships among the students. Such agencies would also afford ample scope to the Christian members of the faculty to render direct service to the Chinese Church.

The *third course* possible for the Church *is to desist from further efforts to register our church conducted schools until the unsatisfactory restrictions have been repealed, but in the meantime to negotiate with the authorities for the satisfactory modification of the restrictive regulations*. It has seemed to not a few that the Christian constituency in China has been too passive and has permitted the individuals and agencies opposed to Christian education to have practically a free field in influencing the policies of the Government.

In the final analysis, does not the ultimate solution of this perplexing situation lie in the promotion of a programme of intensive religious education in the church and in the home? The creation of the present situation in China may be the Providence of God, forcing His misguided children to restore to the Church and to the home the primary responsibility for the Christian nurture of our children.

It has been remarked that when Christianity came to China, it found the home the training centre in religion for the child, and transferred this function from the home to the school. Is it not possible that God is using these present circumstances to compel us to restore to the home the responsibility for the religious nurture of the child? As we mentally canvass the existing situation, we discover that Christian parents in China have almost wholly relied upon the Christian school to inculcate and develop in their children the Christian virtues and the Christian faith. Yet when we of the West recall the agencies and individuals to which we are most indebted for our Christian loyalties and virtues, we invariably give this credit to our Christian home.

As long as the Kuomingtang permits the Church to maintain an intensive programme of religious training and worship for Christian parents and their children on Sundays and in weekday schools of religion, in the church outside of school hours, and as long as it is possible for the Church to train Christian

parents to provide Christian nurture for their children in the home, we need not be too concerned regarding the policies of the Government respecting secular education.

If, however, the Christian movement in China is to meet adequately the spiritual needs of our churches and Christian homes, we must make a thorough re-study of the whole field of religious education, including methods, material and agencies. It is therefore most opportune that at this time the World's Sunday School Association is sending a special deputation to China to co-operate with the Chinese Church in a comprehensive survey of the field of religious education within the Christian movement in China. It is hoped that as a result of this survey and the findings derived therefrom, the Chinese Church will organize her forces and direct her activities, under the guidance and power of the Holy Spirit, so as to enable her to meet the challenge of the present situation that there may eventuate a Christian China, which we assuredly know to be the greatest boon that can come to this mighty nation now in the process of rebuilding.

As to whether religion has any abiding values and should have a place in China's modern State, this is a direct challenge to the Christian men and women of China and to the so-called Christian nations of the West. If we Christians now resident in China truly live the Christian life and give Jesus an opportunity to reproduce Himself in our lives, the result will be personalities so attractive and contagious that there will be no doubt as to the ultimate issue. A most potent factor to influence the builders of a new China to build religion—the religion of Jesus —into the new State, would undoubtedly be a more faithful application of the principles of Christ in their international relations by our so-called Christian nations of the West.

We covet sincerely and passionately the best and the most worth-while for the new emerging Chinese State. We are thoroughly convinced that Christianity can be the most generous contributor of the best and the most worth-while. May no mistaken policies of missionary societies or Chinese Church, no un-Christian attitudes of any who call themselves Christians, no blinded prejudice on the part of national rebuilders cause China to be deprived of the best and the most worth-while—*Christus summum donum!*

CHRISTIAN TEACHING FOR YOUNG CHILDREN

IT is now generally admitted that the Christian churches are not retaining their hold over the younger generation. Some blame the churches and others blame youth, and into that rather futile controversy I will not be tempted. I would, however, endeavour to draw attention to one feature of the problem to which singularly little consideration has been given, and which should, I venture to think, make an especial appeal to those who, willingly or unwillingly, have to bear the label Modernist. I mean the inadequacy of the assistance that is given to parents of very young children in regard to religious instruction.

Long before I became a parent I believed, and I still believe it more ardently than ever, that the main reason why the Christian churches are losing their hold over the community is that they teach a view of Christ and of the world that is contrary to the knowledge acquired in subjects that are ordinarily outside religion. The life and teaching of Christ are from the beginning so associated with physical miracles that, if disbelief in the conventional interpretation of miracles comes, interest and belief in the life and example of Christ are largely extinguished. I am convinced that this is the fundamental cause of the present-day lack of support for the churches and for the lack of confessed faith in Christian teaching.

This belief arose out of my own experience. Like most of my generation and our forbears, I was brought up to believe that the Bible was beyond questioning and that it contained all that was necessary for salvation. The Old and New Testaments were put before me more or less literally, and in consequence I found myself at about sixteen convinced that my religious teaching had not been true. I did not believe that Jesus only had one parent on earth, that He had walked on the sea or that His physical body rose after death. Nor did I believe that the sun had stood still at human command or that river waters had been held up for the passage of God's chosen people. So Old and New Testaments were set aside. A rather Pecksniffian sense of

intellectual superiority settled upon me. Later I became wiser and more modest. I realized that there were plenty of leading men in the churches, especially in the Church of England, who did not insist that belief in physical miracles was an essential for a Christian, or even for a practising Churchman. Contact with the Modern Churchmen's Union taught me a great deal. If that contact had come earlier I should have been spared much youthful torment and perhaps more would have been saved out of the wreckage of my earliest instruction. But, looking around me, I am convinced that comparatively few of those who, like myself, discarded the conventional presentation of the Bible and Christianity have ever emerged out of their agnostic condition. Today the majority has not only grown out of early impressions, but has discarded all contact with Church and all but a purely nominal loyalty to Christianity. If they had been taught otherwise in childhood, would this have happened? Our country is full of unconscious Modernists whom it is now too late to recover for church life. What is of far more importance, many of them have drifted beyond any avowed acceptance of Christian standards. Had they been brought up on a different presentation of Christianity, one that did not conflict with the scientific discoveries of the last centuries, would this majority have passed out into the wilderness? I believe not.

So when we became parents, my wife and I resolved to do what we could to save our children from the reactions that come with a realization that religious teaching has to be discarded with belief in fairies and Santa Claus. We soon came to the conclusion that we should have to undertake the early religious education of our children ourselves. Probably most parents come to the conclusion that the religious education of their children is best left in the hands of experts, clerical or lay. That is obviously the easiest course. And yet how often does one meet a clergyman who is prepared to concentrate upon what is common to all Christians and to set aside till reasonable maturity all the matters upon which Christians are divided? Besides, the fact has to be faced that before children are ready even for kindergarten teaching there is ample room, and indeed a real need, for some preliminary religious instruction. My own belief is that the beginnings of religious instruction, like the beginnings in other branches of knowledge (including the laws of life

and sex) should be made by parents in the home. Sunday School teaching can then wait until the children are old enough to have explained to them the circumstances in which the books of the Bible came to be written, and also old enough to understand that among the best of Christians there are divergent views on almost every subject connected with the life of Jesus except his wonderful goodness and value.

Our desire has been that our children shall acquire such a knowledge of the common denominator of the Christian churches as will be likely to last a lifetime. We began by creating a somewhat nebulous idea of God and of his goodness, and this we followed up, about the age of three and a half, with a beginning in the stories of Jesus, whom we presented as the best man who ever lived. The creation of the world, the vicissitudes of the Israelites, the expectation of the Messiah, the miracles of the Gospel story and the journeyings and teachings of the Apostles could all come, we felt, in their time. We decided to begin with presenting Jesus in his purely human life.

But here our difficulties began and I learned that in this vitally important matter Modernists failed us. I could find no books to help. To one who is the merest layman in teaching, books are essential. Children love to be read to, and pictures help them at least as much as words. But I have found no child's book that presents the life of Jesus in such a way that I could honestly say 'Yes' to the child's inevitable enquiry whether I believed what I was reading.

We are not of those superior people who disapprove of fairy stories for children. But we have been surprised by the degree to which our children want to know what is true and what are 'pretended stories'; they enjoy the latter none the less for knowing that they are not true. We did not want our children to believe that Bible stories have to be classed with Jack and the Beanstalk and Red Riding Hood. We have made a special point that the stories about Jesus are true, and our children love them all the more for that reason. We have also made a point of not giving Scripture stories on any set day; we want Jesus to be part of our children's daily life, not a special subject for Sundays.

In my search for suitable books I went to many shops, including those that specialise in religious books. I found plenty

of books, well-illustrated and in real children's language, that were full of accounts which, if our children develop like their parents, they will not accept when they grow up. Some mercifully omitted explanations about the Virgin Birth, but they told of special stars directing the shepherds, of Jesus walking on the water, and of the ascension of his physical body into the air. Other books failed also in their language; one, written for children of from four to six, explained that Joseph was 'espoused to the Virgin Mary.' In all of them the events in the life of Jesus which from our own point of view are of the greatest value, his home, his love for all mankind and especially for children, his gospel, his healing, his temptation, and so on, seemed secondary in comparison with the emphasis laid upon miraculous stories about his birth, actions and death. Almost all the books I saw gave accounts and pictures of Jesus walking on the waters, a story in which I have never been able to see any moral or spiritual significance. As to the Virgin Birth, I cannot think of any more hopeless approach to the life of Jesus as exemplary man. The Virgin Birth and its necessary explanations can only bewilder the fallow mind and encourage the idea that Jesus was not entirely human, and therefore someone whose life it is futile even to try to emulate. Similarly with the Crucifixion and Resurrection, is there any need to mention even the Crucifixion to a child of three or four, or to say more as to the Resurrection than that when the body of Jesus died his spirit continued and continues to live?

In one bookshop after the other I was pressed to buy this or that book which emphasized this or that interpretation of events about which Christians are not united. I went to the S.P.C.K., the Children's Mission, the Quakers, the Unitarians and to numerous general bookshops. I could discover no book which left out the things about which critics rage. And yet surely there is so much in the recorded lives of Jesus that is beyond dispute. In the presentation of him as God's special son, the most wonderful and loving man who ever lived, there is such a vast field for attracting the attention of the child's mind, and for creating a feeling of love towards him, a belief that his example is the highest to which we can all aspire, and a desire to know about him and his work. But the writers of books for children seem

determined to produce good sectarians rather than good Christians.

In the end I had to be content with Mary Rolt's *Baby's Life of Jesus*. It is good, but it gives prominence to such miracles as the walking on the waters and is inadequate upon the teaching of Jesus. The Unitarians have an excellent (but not illustrated) book for boys and girls of about twelve, but nothing for young children. *Jesus the Carpenter of Nazareth* is also invaluable for older children, but again even it is too conventional on miracle. No author has provided a book which will give to young children such teaching as is sure to last their lives. The Rev. W. H. Fox (*A Child's Approach to Religion*) shows us parents how to teach, but nobody has told us what to teach.

Fortified with the best of the books I could find, I began when our elder child was $3\frac{3}{4}$. I showed the books and the pictures, insisted that they must not be kept in the nursery, so as to distinguish them from play-books, and began with Mary's knowledge of the coming Child. The stories of the manger, the shepherds and of Herod were quickly and enthusiastically memorized. The home life of Jesus also. I found the fact that Joseph was a carpenter particularly helpful. Whatever brings the account of Jesus' life into the child's own experience has special value, if at times the child's reactions to familiar events are disconcerting.

On this foundation can come later the events recorded in the Gospels about which men dispute. Later on we shall tell our children that there are many views of these records. But it is our great hope that our foundation will never be shaken and that, come what may, our children will at least believe in the perfect humanity of Jesus. Frankly, we do not worry about whether our children later become members of this or that church, or even of none. They shall have their foundation and later their chance of choosing for themselves. But, so far as we can prevent it, they shall not be tempted, if they later discard miracle, to throw away the invaluable common denominator of all Christian churches as well.

Later on, when the time comes for the children to read the Bible themselves, we are determined not to disguise our own doubts and ignorance. I shall try to explain the kind of men

who wrote the books of the Old Testament and the Gospel stories and the kind of scientific knowledge available to them at the time. As occasion offers, the fact that men hold different views about many recorded events and passages will be emphasized, and I shall frankly tell our children that I hope that one day they will study these difficulties for themselves and form their own opinions.

Already I am convinced that this simple Bible teaching has been a wonderful link between parent and child, and though, as in everything else, we are ready for disappointment, I do believe that the foundations now being laid will endure. Our children, whatever views they may eventually hold on the points that divide Christians, will, I hope, never be tempted to cast off those bed-rock elements on which all Christian churches can unite. I do not believe that any particular faith is essential to salvation, but I do believe that in the battle with life the examples of Our Lord as man has greater strengthening powers than any belief. And I am convinced that to-day the Christian churches would have far greater power if children generally were taught first of the life of Jesus the man and then initiated into the elements of Christianity about which unison among Christians is impossible.

But if there are other parents who think as we do, I fear that they will get little help from the publishers of children's books. It seems strange that this should be so, but there seems to be a general view among such publishers that what is mostly needed is a number of books calculated and guaranteed to produce eager members of this or that sect of Christians, fully primed with all the particular embroideries which the sects have spun round the human life of Jesus. Meanwhile those who believe that the embroideries and the sectionalism are barriers and that, if emphasized too greatly, they endanger the fundamentals must rely very largely on their own resources.

It seems strange that there is so little help for those who want their children mainly to be Christians and to have faith in the human Jesus. Surely some Modernists will step in and provide for our need? I firmly believe that, if we were all taught first the things about Jesus in which there is widespread agreement, there would be less occasion to-day for our religious leaders to bemoan the flight from the churches.

CLAUD MULLINS.

BOOK REVIEWS

THOMAS HARDY AND HIS CHURCH*

This second volume of Mrs. Hardy's life of her husband sheds an interesting light upon the great novelist's attitude in later life towards the Church of England in which he had been brought up, and which still retained his loyal affection.

We read that through the years 1920 to 1925 Hardy was interested in conjectures on rationalising the English Church.

> 'There had been rumours for some years of a revised liturgy, and his hopes were accordingly raised by the thought of making the Established Church comprehensive enough to include the majority of thinkers of the previous hundred years who had lost all belief in the supernatural. When the new Prayer Book appeared, however, his hopes were doomed to disappointment, and he found that the revision had not been in a rationalistic direction, and from that time he lost all expectation of seeing the Church representative of modern thinking minds.'

In a letter written to an Oxford correspondent in 1926, less than two years before his death, Hardy observes that when he was young he had experienced a wish to enter the ministry of the Church.

> 'I am now too old,' he continues, 'to take up the questions you lay open, but I may say that it has seemed to me that a simpler plan than that of mental reservation in passages no longer literally accepted (which is puzzling to ordinary congregations) would be just to abridge the creeds and other primitive parts of the liturgy, leaving only the essentials. Unfortunately there appears to be a narrowing instead of a broadening tendency among the clergy of late, which if persisted in will exclude still more people from Church. But if a strong body of young reformers were to make a bold stand, in a sort of New Oxford Movement, they would have a tremendous backing from the thoughtful laity, and might overcome the retrogressive section of the clergy.'

Hardy was convinced that in essentials his own view did not differ from what the Church had always taught. When, on the appearance of *Jude,* the then Bishop of Wakefield announced in a letter to the press that he had thrown the volume on the fire, Mrs. Hardy tells us that her husband's reaction to this gesture was one of an amused sadness; like Gibbon he knew not whether to smile or to sigh.

> 'Knowing the difficulty of burning a thick book even in a good fire, and the infrequency of fires of any sort in summer, Hardy was mildly sceptical of the literal truth of the bishop's story.'

And even when the scandalised prelate used his influence to get the novel withdrawn from the libraries,

> 'The only sad feature to Hardy was that if the bishop could have known him as he was, he would have found a man whose personal conduct, views of morality and of the vital facts of religion hardly differed from his own.'

The truth is, one must suppose, that unfamiliar ideas must always seem blasphemous to the conventionally unimaginative.

> 'He said once—perhaps often—that although invidious critics had

* *The Later Years of Thomas Hardy* (1892—1928). By F. E. Hardy. (Macmillan's, 1930. 18/-.)

cast slurs upon him as Nonconformist, Agnostic, Atheist, Infidel, Immoralist, Heretic, Pessimist, or something else equally opprobrious in their eyes, they had never thought of calling him what they might have called him much more plausibly—churchy; not in an intellectual sense, but in so far as instincts and emotions ruled. As a child, to be a parson had been his dream; moreover, he had several clerical relatives who held livings; while his grandfather, father, uncle, brother, wife, cousin and two sisters had been musicians in various churches over a period covering altogether more than a hundred years. He himself had frequently read the church lessons, and had at one time as a young man begun reading for Cambridge with a view to taking Orders.'

Hardy, after a visit to Exeter Cathedral, remarked that he would prefer to be a cathedral organist to anything else in the world. With his knowledge of architecture and his instinctive appreciation of village life, he probably felt more at home in a country church than nine-tenths of the clergy who became incumbents in them and understood their spirit about as well as a Mayor of Chicago would understand Piers Plowman.

One saying of Hardy's, quoted in this biography, goes deep:

'My opinion is that a poet should express the emotion of the ages and the thought of his own.'

Ought not these words also to apply to the religious teacher? But at present it is to be feared that these are as ignorant of the thought of their own age as they are insensitive to the emotion of the ages which are past.

J. C. HARDWICK.

HOW TO BE HAPPY.*

These lay sermons, for such they may be termed, by Mr. Bertrand Russell may be read with profit by the innumerable people who have no guide for their lives save the superficialities of public opinion. The book will also be useful to the clergy as a source of material for use in the pulpit on Sundays. There are chapters with such titles as 'What makes People Unhappy?' 'Boredom and Excitement,' 'Fatigue,' 'Envy,' 'The Persecution Mania,' 'Zest,' 'Work' and 'Effort and Resignation.' All are highly readable, and all, as one would expect, contain a great deal of wisdom, both practical and of the deeper sort. One or two quotations may illustrate the quality of these pages:

'I was not born happy. As a child, my favourite hymn was 'Weary of earth and laden with my sin.' At the age of five, I reflected that, if I should live to be seventy, I had only endured, so far, a fourteenth part of my whole life. In adolescence I hated life and was continually on the verge of suicide, from which, however, I was restrained by the desire to know more mathematics. Now, on the contrary, I enjoy life; I might almost say that every year that passes I enjoy it more. This is due partly to having discovered what things I most desired . . . partly to having dismissed certain objects of desire . . . But very largely it is due to a diminishing preoccupation with myself.'

'If I were a medical man, I should prescribe a holiday to any patient who considered his work important. One of the symptoms of approaching nervous breakdown is the belief that one's work is terribly important, and that to take a holiday would bring all kinds of disaster.'

'Envy is, I should say, one of the most universal and deep-seated of human passions.'

* *The Conquest of Happiness* By Bertrand Russell. (Allen & Unwin, 1930. 7/6.)

'Of the more highly educated sections of the community, the happiest in the present day are the men of science. Many of the most eminent of them are emotionally simple, and obtain from their work a satisfaction so profound that they can derive pleasure from eating and even marrying . . . All the conditions of happiness are realised in the life of the man of science. He has an activity which utilises his abilities to the full, and he achieves results which appear important not only to himself but to the general public, even when it cannot in the smallest degree understand them. In this he is more fortunate than the artist. When the public cannot understand a picture or a poem, they conclude that it is a bad picture or a bad poem. When they cannot understand the theory of relativity they conclude (rightly) that their education has been insufficient. Consequently Einstein is honoured while the best painters are left to starve in garrets, and Einstein is happy while the painters are unhappy . . . The artist is in the painful position of having to choose between being despised and being despicable.'

'Among savages, even collective enterprises, in so far as they exist, are spontaneous and impulsive. When the tribe is going to war the tom-tom rouses military ardour, and herd excitement inspires each individual to the necessary activity. Modern enterprises cannot be managed in this way. When a train has to be started at a given moment it is impossible to inspire the porters, the engine-driver and the signalman by means of barbaric music.'

'It is better to do nothing than to do harm. Half the useful work in the world consists of combating the harmful work.'

'Nothing is more fatiguing nor, in the long run, more exasperating, than the daily effort to believe things which daily become more incredible.'

These detached quotations, which do no justice to the logical texture of the book, will indicate that Mr. Russell's chapters are entertaining as well as instructive. J.C.H.

JOHN GAMBLE'S SERMONS.*

Those of our readers who knew Canon John Gamble will feel grateful to Mr. J. H. Fowler for this delightful volume of selected sermons, and to Bishop David for his discerning Introduction to them. John Gamble was a scholar with a philosophical mind. He saw life *sub specie aeternitatis,* and yet he saw it also in a very shrewd and practical way. Had he been a dreamy mystic he would have been a dreary preacher, but he was a citizen of the world, a lover of great literature, and a keen critic of men and events—and yet conscious all the while that we dwell among shadows and symbols, that we see through a glass darkly, that we are greater than we know and are the natives of a universe which is eternal and divine. Hence there was something unusually arresting and satisfying about his preaching. He had all the strength of a teacher who has something to teach which he knows is really worth teaching, and who believes that the form of his message is of hardly less importance than its content. He died suddenly in Italy. He preached his last sermon in Bristol Cathedral on the 10th February, 1929, from the text: 'They that wait on the Lord shall renew their strength' (*Isaiah,* xl, 31). Its opening paragraph is a good example of his style:

> 'We do not, as a rule, like to be bidden to wait. We do not like to wait when we are young, because we are eager to begin, and we feel a match for the difficulties that may confront us. Still less do we

* *The Sower and Other Sermons.* By John Gamble, B.D. Edited by J. H. Fowler. (Pub. J. W. Arrowsmith, Bristol, 1930. Price 5/-.)

like it when we are growing old, because the available years are becoming few, and if we are to see our heart's desire we must see it soon.'

This quality of terse and pellucid simplicity reminds us of the style of John Henry Newman, whom Gamble much admired. The sermon which follows opens with a passage which again suggests irresistibly, especially in the way in which the Scriptural phrase occurs, the same great master of English prose:

'The human spirit has its tides like the ocean. It has its days of warmth and its days of coldness, seasons when with God's assured aid nothing seems impossible, and evil days when fears are in the way, and the grasshopper becomes a burden.'

Here in a season of calm weather—as in some quiet hour we read these pages—we hear the distant notes of the choir invisible, and have sight of that immortal sea which brought us hither. H.D.A.M.

THE ROOT OF THE MATTER.*

In the preface, Professor Pringle-Pattison states that though, as its title indicates his *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion* does not claim to be a systematic text-book of the Philosophy of Religion, it is something more than a collection of detached studies. It is, in fact, a clear and systematic study of the line of development which culminates in Christian theism. The author regards the function of the philosopher within the sphere of religion as three-fold. He must make a survey of the facts supplied by the history of religion. He must search for the common principle in human nature which finds expression in the various stages of religion as it developes from lower to higher. He must strive to effect the restatement of religious doctrines necessary to bring them into harmony with our general experience.

Four chapters are devoted to a consideration of the beginnings of religion. They contain a survey of the work of the anthropologists during the last fifty or sixty years with a criticism of their theories. The criticism, which has special reference to the theories of Tylor, Frazer and Durkheim is largely directed against the method of seeking a 'minimum definition' of religion. Professor Pringle-Pattison holds that there is good ground for regarding emotion as the primary religious fact. As reflection advances religious concepts or doctrines are 'precipitated.' A cut-and-dried theory of religion can hardly be true to the reality of an organic development so conceived. Of Frazer's neat theory of the relationship between Magic, Religion and Science, he writes:

'But in truth an age of pure magic, as described in the *Golden Bough,* without a glimmer of religious feeling, is as much a myth as the pre-social condition of pure selfishness and anarchy—the *bellum omnium contra omnes*—from which, according to Hobbes and many other theorists, mankind was supposed to be delivered by a "social contract." In either case, had the myth been a reality, it could have had no such sequel as the theory gives it. "Given a world of knaves, to evolve an honesty from their united action": so Carlyle sarcastically described the attempt of certain ethical theorists. You cannot develop social order and cohesion out of pure selfishness and anarchy. Neither philosophy nor history knows any 'transitions' of the kind

* *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion.* By A. Seth Pringle-Pattison, L L.D., D.C.L. (Published by Oxford University Press. Price 12/6.)

> suggested. All that history can show, or philosophy can justify, is the gradual unfolding of mental capacities and modes of action which we can trace back indefinitely to more rudimentary forms. It must be wrong, therefore, to start our discussion of religion with a definition which compels us to deny its presence in ceremonies and practices of a more primitive type, simply because they do not conform to the definition laid down.'

This discussion of origins is followed by a sketch of Greek religion and philosophy, an account of the development of Hebrew religion from Tribal Monolatry to Monotheism with special reference to the influence of Persian religion on post-exilic apocalyptic and angelology, and a chapter on 'The Historic Jesus' as portrayed in the Synoptic Gospels. Though Professor Pringle-Pattison agrees with Mr. Montefiore that the Synoptic picture of Jesus 'is throughout covered with a varnish which here and there does not allow anything of the original to shine through,' he is yet convinced that a scientific application of critical methods does enable us in large measure to get behind the varnish. He is not in agreement with the extreme eschatological school of criticism. Jewish eschatology, indeed, provided the form in which Jesus conceived his mission, but the essence of his consciousness of mission lay in the closeness of his communion with his God and Father. He did not merely teach the fatherhood; he lived the sonship.' At the same time it is important to remember that 'divine sonship could not even remotely suggest to Jewish ears the metaphysical relation which it afterwards came to signify in Christian theology.'

The way is now cleared for a consideration of the transformation, under the influence of apocalyptic ideas, the mystery-religions, and Greek philosophy, of the gospel *of* Jesus into a gospel *about* Jesus. The initial stage of the transformation was due to S. Paul who, having never known Jesus in the flesh, from the beginning conceived Christ as a pre-existing heavenly being. This Christ he proclaimed in a world familiar with the ideas and terminology of the mystery religions. The mystery religions, in fact, provided the soil and atmosphere in which Christianity took root and grew. The pre-existing Messiah became the Saviour-God. The theology of S. Paul was further developed and rounded off in the Fourth Gospel which is 'the Life of Jesus, re-written at the close of the first century in the spirit of St. Paul's conception, as the conscious progress of a divine Being across this earthly stage, and expressed for the Greek-speaking world in terms of the current Logos philosophy.' Professor Pringle-Pattison envisages the later developments of Catholic theology as a continuous series of attempts, in the outcome far from successful, to resolve the difficulties inherent in this conception of Christ as they become explicit in the course of the first seven centuries. He agrees with Dr. Temple that the history of the later stages of Christological controversy 'represents the bankruptcy of Greek patristic theology; it marks the definite failure of all attempts to explain the Incarnation in terms of Essence, Substance, Nature and the like.' He considers the old conception of substance to be materialistic and quotes with approval Dr. Temple's judgment that 'the breakdown was inevitable, because the spirit cannot be expressed in terms of substance at all.' But unlike Dr. Temple he feels that if it is a valid criticism that the traditional doctrine is 'in essence materialistic,' then 'some reinterpretation of the dogma is an urgent necessity.' The Council of Chalcedon reaffirmed the fact of the two natures. This, in the opinion of Dr. Temple, 'is exactly what an authoritative formula ought to do.' 'But surely,' says Professor Pringle-Pattison, 'it is a futile procedure simply to re-affirm a

fact, when the question is in what sense the fact is to be understood, what intelligible meaning it holds for us.' Of Dr. Temple's modified Kenotic theory expounded in *Christus Veritas* he is sharply critical.

> 'Dr. Temple says at one point in his book that "if standing before them in the flesh Jesus had said to those devout Jews 'I am God,' he would have reduced them to mere bewilderment." He fails to realize that his own language in pressing the same claim often produces in his readers a similar sense of stupefaction.'

Professor Pringle-Pattison makes it clear that reinterpretation must proceed on ethical and spiritual lines. Theologians must free themselves, as indeed many are doing, from the shackles of an obsolete metaphysic.

> 'In every religion the question at issue is the character of its God or gods, for on that depends its whole conception of human duty and its views of human destiny. The lesson of Christianity is that we have to think of God in terms of Christ—*sub specie Christi,* if we may adapt a great phrase—in terms, that is to say, of his recorded teaching and of the spirit of his dedicated life and death.'

Professor Pringle-Pattison has succeeded in incorporating in his book a vast amount of material without writing a single dull page. It will appeal not only to the student, but also no less to the educated layman who wishes to get a good general grasp of the position of modern criticism and the problems which confront the theology of to-day. G.L.H.H.

A MODERNIST EIRENICON.*

Under the conviction that at this time of day there ought to be no need for his book, and yet that the need unhappily exists, Mr. Austin has set himself to present, in his *Letters to a Fundamentalist,* the spirit, methods and results of modern Biblical scholarship, so as, in the words of Dr. Garvie, who contributes a commendatory foreword, 'to disclose its great value to the thought and life of the Christian Church, and to remove the prejudices and misrepresentations which have hitherto hindered a more general recognition of that value.' As the recipient of the Letters he visualises the ordinary man in the street or in the pew, who, like himself, was brought up in the old ways of thought, but who is held back from entering into the larger truth by an admixture of timidity, misconception and needless anxiety concerning the ark of God.

For his purpose and in the way he uses it, Mr. Austin's epistolary method is admirable, for the other side of the correspondence is implicitly given, and in this way 'the other fellow' is enabled, by quotation from his chosen authorities, to state his case, and to point out what appear to be weak places in the modernist armour. Opportunity is thus given not only to deal in detail both with the charges brought against criticism and with the traditionalist theories erected against it, but the way is opened up for a presentation of the modernist point of view in its more positive aspects.

For his task the author has the equipment of an adequate knowledge both of that side of the case which he is urging and of that which he is opposing, but as it is no mere dialectical victory he is seeking his best qualification is the spirit of moderation and reasonableness with which he conducts his argument and his manifest loyalty to essential Christian truth. Excellent as the discussions are of individual points both in regard to the methods and the results of criticism, the most valuable service the book performs is its clearing up of the question as to what are the true fun-

* *Letters to a Fundamentalist.* By Percy Austin, B.A. (Student Christian Movement, 1930. 6/-.)

damentals of the faith, and its challenge to the fundamentalist to revise his bibliolatrous definition of Christian discipleship. The Letters close with a passage to which no Fundamentalist can possibly object:

> The Bible is the world's wonder Book. As a literary treasure it is unique, while its moral and spiritual power are immeasurable. However we approach it, we cannot possibly pay too high a tribute to its excellency and worth. It is, and it ever will be, an unfailing source of inspiration for both thought and life. But the supreme value of the Bible is that it is the Book of Christ. And the best tribute we can pay to the Bible is to respond to the lordship of the Christ of the Bible, and to seek to live in His Spirit. In the last analysis the only test of our loyalty to the Bible is our loyalty to Jesus Christ.

G. K. MacBean.

THE OLD-TIME PARSON.*

The Rector in question was the Reverend John Skinner, an antiquary of some note, who lived from 1772 to 1839, and the Journal deals with parochial affairs in the Parish of Camerton from 1822 to 1832.

Life for a clergyman a hundred years ago in a country place was not so very different from what it is to-day. Parishioners were not all idyllic. The Rector writes in his journal:

> 'On going to Mrs. Kimberry's, one of the female Methodists passed me without the slightest inclination of the head, but, on the contrary, with a more marked elevation of it than usual!'
>
> 'There was another marriage this morning. The bride behaved so bad by laughing and other misconduct, I was obliged to say I would stop the ceremony, and the man who gave her away put on his hat in the midst of the church.'

One man borrows £15 and does not repay it; servants complain of their beds and accommodations ('This is the march of intellect with a vengeance: I wish Mr. Brougham had only a tythe of what I am obliged to submit to from the lower orders'); the young woman engaged to teach school proves to be running after a married man from Bath, the messenger who brought the newspaper was intoxicated, and walked in from the kitchen into the parlour; such were the vexations of a parson in the twenties of the last century. Poor Skinner lost his wife early, slept badly, and had trouble with his children. There was cholera, smallpox, consumption, and incredible dirt and callousness. Mr. Llewelyn Powys could base a novel on this Journal. It is well worth publishing, and makes a most interesting volume. J.C.H.

THE MODERN PARENT'S MIRROR.*

The Modern Parent seems to us as sensible a book on the bringing up of children as we have ever come across. The author, who is the Director of Parental Education in an American University, abounds in robust common sense. He is a practical psychologist. He asks:

> 'Should we not teach inhibitions to the child? Yes, indeed, we should. The happy child who will become the happy, lovable, useful citizen is the child who very early learns that there are some things he may not have and some things he may not do' (p. 305).

* *Journal of a Somerset Rector.* Edited by H. Coombs and the Rev. A. N. Bax. (Murray, 1930. 15/-.)

* *The Modern Parent.* By Garry Cleveland Myers, Ph.D. (Pub. Williams & Norgate, 1930. Price 8/6.)

This book will form an excellent manual for needful self-examination by fathers and mothers.

It deals with parents who are discourteous to their children, make the social graces painful to their children, disagree before their children, are inconsistent, act childishly towards their children, teach their children to be liars, tempt their children to be thieves, enkindle fears in their children, intensify their children's jealousies, are like machines, have no imagination, make themselves their children's slaves, rob their children of responsibility, play on the heart-strings of their children, punish them injudiciously or else do not punish them at all.

Our readers will feel that this is a book to make parents tremble. This is not so; but it is a book which will, if put into practice, make happy homes and worthy citizens. It does not deal directly with religious education. H.D.A.M.

BISHOP CHAVASSE.*

Mr. Stanley Baldwin said in the House of Commons on 7th June, 1928:—

'I will only mention two names, though there are many more, two saints if ever there were saints, Edward King, Bishop of Lincoln, and Francis James Chavasse, Bishop of Liverpool, representing the two streams, and I want those streams to go on.'

Canon J. B. Lancelot's life of Dr. Chavasse, written in a way to bring out his very human saintliness, will be much valued by those who knew the Bishop. He was altogether devoted to his duties. One of his children wrote: 'My father, I fear, had no hobbies except his work.' His advice to an ordinand was characteristic: 'Stick to principles and not to people. People change and disappoint, but principles remain unaltered.' He opposed the Deposited Book unflinchingly because it sanctioned Reservation and altered the Communion Service. He wrote to a friend:

> 'I am very anxious about the Revised Prayer Book. It will accentuate and not remove our differences. It is not likely to materialize, but what will be the next step? There is so much that is excellent and up-to-date, but it is not good policy to try to carry what is doubtful and contentious on the back of what is admirable and much needed.'

Had it been legalised he was resolved to begin and work at once for a new revision.

The founder of Liverpool Cathedral and St. Peter's Hall, Oxford, did a great work for the Church in his day. H.D.A.M.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Epic of the Old Testament (Arthur H. Wood, M.A. Humphrey Milford, 6/-) is designed to remove the obstacle which the order of the Books of the Old Testament in our English Bible presents to a clear grasp of their historical sequence. It consists of selected passages arranged in chronological order, and linked together by a chain of concise summaries of the political, social and religious situations with which the passages deal. The selection serves its purpose admirably, in particular by setting the writings of the prophets in the historical context to which modern scholarship assigns them. A not unattractive feature is the use of the versions of Wyclif, Tyndale and the other early translators in the case of the primitive narratives, for the purpose of suggesting to the reader the development of Hebrew narrative-style from its unsophisticated beginnings.

* *Francis James Chavasse.* By J. B. Lancelot. (Pub. B. Blackwell, 1930. 3/6.)

The Wisdom Literature is represented by a series of excerpts arranged under subject-headings.

The Bishop of London's *Good News from God* (Longmans, Green and Co., 3/6, 1930) follows the line of previous series of his Lenten addresses, and bears the characteristic marks of his personality, earnestness, simplicity and directness. There is a vein of homely illustration throughout, the product of the Bishop's sympathetic contact with all kinds and classes of men and women.

Dr. Geary's book bearing the *Nihil Obstat* of the censor, *Catholicism: A Religion of Common Sense* (P. J. Gearson, O.C.C., D.D. Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 2/6, 1930), furnishes the reader with an attractive statement of Roman Catholic beliefs. It would require prodigious space to give reasons for dissenting from the claim made by the title of the book. It will suffice to quote as a sample of the author's arguments his explanation of the method by which his Church arrives at her dogmas of Church and Bible:

> 'We Catholics first of all prove that the Bible is an ordinary trustworthy historical document. This trustworthiness is discovered by historical investigation. From reading its pages we see clearly by using our reason that Christ is God and that He established a Church which would be specially guided by Him in making her declarations, in telling us things which we must believe.
>
> 'This Church now tells us that God wrote the Bible, that He inspired it; and we Catholics can safely take her word in the matter. What we now prove from the Church's pronouncement is not the trustworthiness of the Bible as an historical document (that has been already proved by historical investigation), but we prove the *Divine* trustworthiness of the Bible, its *Divine* origin. Thus from A we prove B, and from B we prove C.'

This argument, it should be observed, is used in the context to refute the charge against Catholics of 'falling into a vicious circle in dealing with the Bible.'

The Clarendon Bible, to which *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (H. Balmforth, M.A. Clarendon Press, 4/6) belongs, has in view the requirements of teachers, elder pupils, and others, who are unable to read the Bible in the old way, and it aims at putting forward 'a constructive view of the books and their teaching, taking into consideration and welcoming results as to which there is a large measure of agreement among scholars.' Mr. Balmforth's edition of St. Luke excellently fulfils this aim, giving a presentation of the Gospel marked equally by sound technical knowledge and spiritual insight. The extended discussions on important questions are scholarly as well as interesting; there is a judicious limitation of the annotations on linguistic points, and the sources of further knowledge are indicated *passim*. The text used is the Revised Version, and where Greek words or phrases are used in the notes they are translated.

G.K.McB.

A CORRECTION.

Professor H. J. Rose, of St. Andrew's University, points out that Terence write *Amantium irae amoris integratio est,* and deplores the barbarous Latinity of the phrase as it appears on p. 199 of the July *Modern Churchman*. We deplore it also.—Ed., *M.C.*

CORRESPONDENCE

EUGENICS AND BIRTH CONTROL.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

I have read your series of articles on Birth Control and kindred subjects with great interest, but in some of them there is a certain note of doubt and hesitancy which might have puzzled your readers. The cause is, I think, due to the writers not taking into consideration the change which took place about a dozen years ago. It is as well to state this, for it clears up much misunderstanding.

Up to about 1918 Birth Control and its possibilities unfortunately had been too much neglected and ignored by the scientists and the doctors. It was left mainly in the hands of charlatans and abortionists. Many looked upon Birth Control as merely of interest to those who wanted to lead an immoral life. About then, however, Marie Stopes (Doctor of Science, London), realising this awful state of affairs, decided it must continue no longer, because she also realised the wonderful powers and possibilities for good which Birth Control contained. She therefore, as a scientist, set about giving public instruction on the subject.

Knowing all this, one can quite understand and sympathize with the Church authorities and other responsible people for keeping away from the subject. It required a very brave and exceptional person of independent means to dare to cut the knot. Dr. Marie Stopes with her scientific training and religious up-bringing was one of the few who could do it. Her powerful and convincing books and articles have influenced for good millions of people all over the world. Your readers will be interested to know that from the beginning she has been helped on and cheered by individual clergymen.

H. V. ROE.

Heatherbank, Hindhead, Surrey.
October 5th, 1930.

SIR,

You were good enough to announce in the editorial notes of your last issue that my address on 'Eugenics and Population' was contributed at the last moment—so much so, indeed, that it was not possible for me to make verbal preparation. May I take this opportunity of further informing your readers that my subsequent illness prevented me from reading the proofs. They therefore read a paper which had had no verbal preparation, and which was, in fact, the verbatim report of an impromptu speech. In the circumstances the reporter did remarkably well, but it was quite inevitable that he should in some cases misunderstand or misrepresent my words.

ELDON MOORE.

Eliot Vale House, Blackheath.
October 17th, 1930.

[We were between Scylla and Charybdis, either to omit Mr. Eldon Moore's address from our Conference Number—that would have seemed discourteous—or to publish it uncorrected by its author. We chose what we believe our readers will regard as the lesser evil. We ought to add that we were not aware of Mr. Eldon Moore's illness, it being by us supposed that he was holiday-making. Should we publish a second edition of the Conference Number we shall publish his address with full corrections.—ED., *M.C.*]